arXiv:1407.4817v2 [quant-ph] 9 Jan 2015

# Reliable quantum certification for photonic quantum technologies

Leandro Aolita[1], Christian Gogolin[1,2,3], Martin Kliesch[1], and Jens Eisert[1]

[1]Dahlem Center for Complex Quantum Systems, Freie Universität Berlin, 14195 Berlin, Germany
[2]ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fotòniques, Mediterranean Technology Park, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain
[3]Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Str. 1, 85748 Garching, Germany

**A major roadblock for large-scale photonic quantum technologies is the lack of practical reliable certification tools. We introduce an experimentally friendly — yet mathematically rigorous — certification test for experimental preparations of arbitrary $m$-mode pure Gaussian states, pure non-Gaussian states generated by linear-optical circuits with $n$-boson Fock-basis states as inputs, and states of these two classes subsequently post-selected with local measurements on ancillary modes. The protocol is efficient in $m$ and the inverse post-selection success probability for all Gaussian states and all mentioned non-Gaussian states with constant $n$. We follow the mindset of an untrusted prover, who prepares the state, and a skeptic certifier, with classical computing and single-mode homodyne-detection capabilities only. No assumptions are made on the type of noise or capabilities of the prover. Our technique exploits an extremality-based fidelity bound whose estimation relies on non-Gaussian state nullifiers, which we introduce on the way as a byproduct result. The certification of many-mode photonic networks, as those used for photonic quantum simulations, boson samplers, and quantum metrology, is now within reach.**

Many-body quantum devices promise exciting applications in ultra-precise quantum metrology[1], quantum computing[2–4], and quantum simulators[5–9]. In the quest for their large-scale realisation, impressive progress on a variety of quantum technologies has recently been made[6–9]. Among them, optical implementations play a key role. For example, sophisticated manipulations of multi-qubit entangled states of up to eight parametrically down-converted photons[10,11] have been demonstrated and continuous-variable entanglement among 60 stable[12] and up to 10000 flying[13] modes has been verified in optical set-ups. In addition, small-sized simulations of BosonSampling[14–17] and Anderson localisation in quantum walks[18,19] have been performed with on-chip integrated linear-optical networks.

This fast pace of advance, however, makes the problem of *reliable certification* an increasingly pressing issue[20–24]. From a practical viewpoint, further experimental progress on many-body quantum technologies is nowadays hindered by the lack of practical certification tools. At a fundamental level, certifying many-body quantum devices is ultimately about testing quantum mechanics in regimes where it has never been tested before.

Tomographic characterisation of quantum states requires the measurement of exponentially many observables. Compressed-sensing techniques[25] reduce, for states approximated by low-rank density matrices, the requirements significantly, but still demand exponentially many measurements. Efficient certification techniques, requiring only polynomially many measurements, for universal quantum computation[26,27] and a restricted model of computation with one pure qubit[28] exist in the form of quantum interactive proofs. However, these require either a fully fledged fault-tolerant universal quantum computer[26,27] or an experimentally non-trivial measurement-based quantum device[28]. In addition, these methods involve sequential interaction rounds with the device[26–28]. In contrast, permutationally invariant tomography[29], Monte-Carlo fidelity estimation[30–32], and Clifford-circuit benchmarking techniques[33] provide experimentally friendly alternatives for the efficient certification of preparations of permutationally invariant[29] and qubit stabiliser or W states[30–33], respectively. Nevertheless, none of these methods addresses continuous-variable systems, not even in Gaussian states.

Here, we introduce an experimentally friendly technique for the direct certification of continuous-variable state preparations without estimating the prepared state itself. First, we discuss intuitively and define rigorously reliable quantum-state certification tests. We do this for two notions of certification, differing in that in one of them robustness against preparation errors is mandatory. Then, we present a certification test, based on single-mode homodyne detection, for arbitrary $m$-mode pure Gaussian states, non-Gaussian states resulting from Gaussian unitary operators acting on Fock-basis states with $n$ photons, and states prepared by post-selecting states in either of the two classes with measurements on $a < m$ ancillary modes in arbitrary local bases. This covers, for instance, Gaussian quantum simulations such as those of refs. 12 and 13 as well as the non-Gaussian ones of refs. 6, 10, 11, 14–19. Furthermore, so-called de-Gaussified (photon-subtracted) Gaussian states[34–37] as well as all non-Gaussian states accessible to qumode-encoded qubit[38,39] or finite-squeezing qumode[40,41] quantum computers also lie within the range of applicability of our method. The protocol is efficient in $m$ and, for the cases with post-selection, in the inverse polynomial post-selection success probability, for all Gaussian states and all mentioned non-Gaussian states with constant $n$.

With a high probability, our test rejects all experimental preparations with a fidelity with respect to the chosen target




Figure 1. **Different certification paradigms**. (*a*) Naive approach: To certify an untrusted experimental preparation $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ of the target state $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$, a certifier Arthur would like to run a statistical test that, for all $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$, decides whether the fidelity $F$ between $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ and $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ is greater or equal than a pre-specified threshold $F_{\mathrm{T}} < 1$ (green region, accept), or smaller than it (red region, reject). However, due to the preparations at the boundary of the two regions and experimental uncertainties, a test able to make such a decision does not exist. (*b*) The ideal scenario: A more realistic certification notion is to ask that the test rejects every $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ for which $F < F_{\mathrm{T}}$ (red region) and accepts every $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ for which $F \geq F_{\mathrm{T}} + \Delta$ (green region), for some given $\Delta < 1 - F_{\mathrm{T}}$. Here, a buffer region of width $\Delta$ (in grey) is introduced within which the behaviour of the test can be arbitrary, but, in return, the certification is now feasible. This type of certification is thus robust against experimental infidelities as large as $1 - F_{\mathrm{T}} - \Delta$. (*c*) The practical scenario: Finally, the least one can demand is that the test rejects every $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ for which $F < F_{\mathrm{T}}$ (red region) and accepts at least $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ (green point). The former condition is sometimes called *soundness* and the latter one *completeness*. Here, no acceptance is guaranteed for any $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ with $F \geq F_{\mathrm{T}}$ (grey region) other than $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ itself, but any $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ accepted by the test necessarily features $F \geq F_{\mathrm{T}}$. This certification notion is not robust against state deviations, but it can be more practical. In addition, in practice, the resulting tests succeed also in accepting many $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}} \neq \varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ for which $F \geq F_{\mathrm{T}}$.

state lower than a desired threshold and accepts if the preparation is sufficiently close to the target. That is, the protocol is robust against small preparation errors. We upper-bound the failure probability in terms of the number of experimental runs and calculate the necessary number of measurement settings. Our method is built upon a fidelity lower bound, based on a natural extremality property, that is interesting in its own right. Finally, the experimental estimation of this bound relies on non-Gaussian state nullifiers, which we introduce on the way.

## Results

We present our results in terms of photons propagating through optical networks, but our methods apply to any bosonic platform with equivalent dynamics. We consider a sceptic certifier, Arthur, with limited quantum capabilities, who wishes to ascertain whether an untrusted quantum prover, Merlin, presumably with more quantum capabilities, can indeed prepare certain quantum states that Arthur cannot. This mindset is reminiscent to that of quantum interactive-proof systems[26–28] of computer science, but our method has the advantage that no interaction apart from the measurements of the certifier on the single-run experimental preparations from the prover is required.

In particular, we consider the situation where Merlin possesses at least a network of active single-mode squeezers and displacers as well as passive beam-splitters and phase-shifters, sufficient to efficiently implement any $m$-mode Gaussian unitary[42–45], plus single-photon sources. Arthur's resources, in contrast, are restricted to classical computational power augmented with single-mode measurements. With that, he can characterise each of his single-mode measurement channels up to any desired constant precision. The task is for Merlin to provide him with copies of an $m$-mode pure *target state* $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ of Arthur's choice. We assume that Merlin follows independent and identical state-preparation procedures on each experimental run, described by the density matrix $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$. We refer to $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ as a *preparation* of the target state $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$. His preparation is unavoidably subject to imperfections and he might even be dishonest and try to trick Arthur. Thus, Arthur would like to run a test, with his own measurement devices, to *certify* whether $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ is indeed a bona fide preparation of $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$.

To measure how good a preparation $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ of $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ is, we use the fidelity between $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ and $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$, defined as

$$F := F(\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}, \varrho_{\mathrm{p}}) := \mathrm{Tr}\left[(\sqrt{\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}}\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}^{\dagger}\sqrt{\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}})^{1/2}\right]^2 = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}\right], \quad (1)$$

where the last equality holds because $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ is assumed to be pure. As we see below, our measurement schemes directly estimate fidelities. However, all our results can also be adapted to the trace distance $D := D(\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}, \varrho_{\mathrm{p}})$, which can be defined via the 1-norm distance in state space as $D(\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}, \varrho_{\mathrm{p}}) := \mathrm{Tr}[|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} - \varrho_{\mathrm{p}}|]/2$. This is due to the fact that $D$ can be bounded from both sides in terms of $F$ through the well-known inequalities $1 - F^2 \leq D \leq \sqrt{1 - F^2}$, where the first inequality holds because $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ is pure.

Let us first discuss what properties an experimental test must fulfil to qualify as a state certification protocol. Different certification paradigms are schematically represented in Fig. 1. We start with the formal definition of certification in the sense of Fig. 1 (c).

**Definition 1** (Quantum state certification)**.** *Let $F_{\mathrm{T}} < 1$ be a threshold fidelity and $\alpha > 0$ a maximal failure probability. A test, which takes as input a classical description of $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ and copies of a preparation $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ and outputs "accept" or "reject" is a* certification test *for $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ if, with probability at least $1-\alpha$, it both rejects every $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ for which $F(\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}, \varrho_{\mathrm{p}}) < F_{\mathrm{T}}$ and accepts $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}} = \varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$. We say that any $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ accepted by such a test is a* certified preparation *of $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$.*

To specify the target states we need to introduce some no-




Figure 2. **Classes of target states**. (*a*) $\mathcal{C}_{\rm G}$ is the class composed of all $m$-mode pure Gaussian states. These can be prepared by applying an arbitrary Gaussian unitary $\hat{U}$ (possibly involving multi-mode squeezing) to the $m$-mode vacuum state $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$. (*b*) The class $\mathcal{C}_{\rm LO}$ includes all $m$-mode pure non-Gaussian states produced at the output of an arbitrary linear-optical network, which implements a passive Gaussian unitary $\hat{U}$ (without squeezing), with the Fock-basis state $|\mathbf{1}_n\rangle$ containing one photon in each of the first $n$ modes and zero in the remaining $m-n$ ones as input. As the order of the modes is arbitrary, choosing the first $n$ modes as the populated ones does not constitute a restriction. (*c*) The third class, $\mathcal{C}_{\rm LPSG}$, encompasses all $(m-a)$-mode pure non-Gaussian states obtained by projecting a subset $\mathcal{A}$ of $a<m$ modes of an $m$-mode pure Gaussian state $\varrho_{\rm t} \in \mathcal{C}_{\rm G}$ onto an arbitrary pure product state $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$. In practice, this is done probabilistically by measuring $\mathcal{A}$ in a local basis that contains $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ and post-selecting only the events in which $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ is measured. Thus, the $a$ modes in $\mathcal{A}$ are used as ancillas, whereas the effective system is given by the subset $\mathcal{S}$ containing the other $m-a$ modes, which carries the final target state. For concreteness, but without any loss of generality, in the plot, the ancillary modes are chosen to be the last $a$ ones. (*d*) Analogously, the class $\mathcal{C}_{\rm LPSLO}$ is that of all $(m-a)$-mode pure non-Gaussian states obtained by projecting the ancillary modes of an $m$-mode pure linear-optical network state $\varrho_{\rm t} \in \mathcal{C}_{\rm LO}$ onto an arbitrary pure product state $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$. These four classes cover the target states considered in the vast majority of quantum photonic experiments.

tation. We denote $m$-mode *Fock basis states* by $|\mathbf{n}\rangle$, with $\mathbf{n} \coloneqq (n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_m)$ being the sequence of photon numbers $n_j \geq 0$ in each mode $j \in [m]$, where the short-hand notation $[m] \coloneqq \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ is introduced, and call $n \coloneqq \sum_{j=1}^{m} n_j$ the *total input photon number*. In particular, we will pay special attention to Fock basis states $|\mathbf{1}_n\rangle$ with exactly one photon in each of the first $n$ modes and the vacuum in the remaining $m-n$ ones, i.e., those for which $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{1}_n$, with

$$\mathbf{1}_n \coloneqq (\underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{n \text{ times}}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{m-n \text{ times}}). \tag{2}$$

Note that $|\mathbf{1}_0\rangle$ is the Gaussian *vacuum state* $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$. We denote the *photon number operator* corresponding to mode $j$ by $\hat{n}_j$ and the *total photon number operator* by $\hat{n} \coloneqq \sum_{j=1}^{m} \hat{n}_j$.

In addition, for post-selected target states, we denote by $\mathcal{A} \coloneqq \{\mathcal{A}_j\}_{j\in[a]}$, where each element $\mathcal{A}_j \in [m]$ labels a different mode, the subset of $a \coloneqq |\mathcal{A}| < m$ modes on which the post-selection measurements are made. We then identify the remaining $m-a$ modes as the system subset $\mathcal{S}$, which carries the post-selected target state $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\rm t}}$. The subindex $\mathcal{S}$ emphasises that $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\rm t}}$ represents an $(m-a)$-mode post-selected target state and distinguishes it from $m$ mode target states without post-selection, which we denote simply as $\varrho_{\rm t}$. We denote by $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \coloneqq |\phi_1\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_1} |\phi_2\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_2} \ldots |\phi_a\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_a}$, with $\{|\phi_j\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_j}\}_{j\in a}$ an arbitrary pure normalised state of mode $\mathcal{A}_j$, an $a$-mode product state on the modes $\mathcal{A}$. We use the short-hand notations $\langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}\, \varrho_{\rm t}\, |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \coloneqq \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}}\left[\varrho_{\rm t}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}})\right]$, where $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}}$ indicates partial trace over the Fock space of $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}$ denotes the identity on $\mathcal{S}$, and $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\rm t}) \coloneqq \mathrm{Tr}\left[\langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}\, \varrho_{\rm t}\, |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\right]$ is the *post-selection success probability*, i.e., the probability of measuring $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ in a projective measurement on $\mathcal{A}$. Without loss of generality, we consider throughout only the non-trivial case $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\rm t}) \neq 0$. Thus, we consider exclusively post-selected target states of the form

$$\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\rm t}} \coloneqq \frac{\langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}\, \varrho_{\rm t}\, |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\rm t})}. \tag{3}$$

With the notation introduced, we derive our results for:

1) Arbitrary $m$-mode pure *Gaussian states*, given by the class

$$\mathcal{C}_{\rm G} \coloneqq \{\varrho_{\rm t} = \hat{U}\, |\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}|\, \hat{U}^\dagger \colon \hat{U} \text{ Gaussian unitary}\}, \tag{4}$$

2) $m$-mode pure *linear-optical network states* from the class

$$\mathcal{C}_{\rm LO} \coloneqq \{\varrho_{\rm t} = \hat{U}\, |\mathbf{1}_n\rangle\langle\mathbf{1}_n|\, \hat{U}^\dagger \colon \hat{U} \text{ passive unitary}\}, \tag{5}$$

3) arbitrary $(m-a)$-mode pure *locally post-selected Gaussian states*, given by the class

$$\mathcal{C}_{\rm LPSG} \coloneqq \{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\rm t}} \colon \varrho_{\rm t} \in \mathcal{C}_{\rm G}\}, \tag{6}$$

4) and $(m-a)$-mode pure *locally post-selected linear-optical network states* from the class

$$\mathcal{C}_{\rm LPSLO} \coloneqq \{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\rm t}} \colon \varrho_{\rm t} \in \mathcal{C}_{\rm LO}\}. \tag{7}$$

The class $\mathcal{C}_{\rm G}$ is crucial within the realm of "continuous-variable" quantum optics and quantum information processing. It encompasses, for instance, "twin-beam" (two-mode

squeezed vacuum) states under passive networks, which are used to simulate, upon coincidence detection, multi-qubit states[6]. The class $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ includes all the settings sometimes referred to as "discrete variable" linear-optical networks. This class covers, among others, the targets of several recent experimental simulations with on-chip integrated linear-optical networks[14–19]. The third class, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$, is the one of locally post-selected Gaussian states. This class includes crucial non-Gaussian resources for quantum information and quantum optics. For instance, when the post-selection is in the Fock basis, it encompasses de-Gaussified photon-subtracted squeezed Gaussian states[34–37]. Furthermore, if apart from Fock-basis measurements, the post-selection uses also quadrature homodyne measurements, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ contains all the states accessible to finite-squeezing cluster-state qumode quantum computers[40,41]. The last class, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$, of locally post-selected linear-optical network states, covers, for the case where the post-selection is in the Fock basis and $n$ is proportional to $m$, all the states prepared by probabilistic schemes of the type of refs. 38 and 39 for universal qumode-encoded qubit quantum computation. Naturally, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ also includes both photon - added or -subtracted linear-optical network states.

The basis of the our certification scheme is a technique for the estimation of the quantity

$$F^{(n)} := 1 - \left\langle (\hat{n} - n) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \hat{n}_j \right\rangle_{\hat{U}^\dagger \varrho_{\mathrm{p}} \hat{U}}, \tag{8}$$

with $n$ the total input photon number. As shown in the Methods section, for all target states $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}} \cup \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$, $F^{(n)}$ is a lower bound on the fidelity $F$ and, moreover, $F^{(n)} = F = 1$ if $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}} = \varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ (see also Methods and Section S2 A of the Supplementary Information (SI) for analogous bounds for the post-selected target states). This bound is a consequence of a natural extremality notion: the smaller the expectation value $\left\langle (\hat{n} - n) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \hat{n}_j \right\rangle_{\hat{U}^\dagger \varrho_{\mathrm{p}} \hat{U}}$ is, the closer are $|\mathbf{1}_n\rangle\langle\mathbf{1}_n|$ and $\hat{U}^\dagger \varrho_{\mathrm{p}} \hat{U}$ and, therefore, the closer are the preparation $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ and the target state $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$. Our test $\mathcal{T}$, summarised in Box 1, yields an estimate $F^{(n)*}$ of $F^{(n)}$. If $F^{(n)*}$ is sufficiently above the threshold $F_{\mathrm{T}}$, the preparation $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ is accepted. Otherwise it is rejected. The estimate $F^{(n)*}$ is obtained via a measurement scheme that depends on the specific target state. In the Gaussian case $n = 0$ the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$ can be used, while linear-optical network states with $n > 0$ require the scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$. $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ are both summarised in the Methods section and described in detail in Boxes S1 and S2, respectively, in Section S2 in the SI. In addition, in Section S2 B of the SI we adapt $\mathcal{T}$ to post-selected target states $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}} \cup \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$, and provide the corresponding adapted measurement schemes in Section S2 C of the SI.

Our theorems guarantee that the test from Box 1 is indeed a certification test and give a bound on the scaling of the number of samples that are needed for the test. In order to state them we introduce some notation related to mode space descriptions of linear-optical networks first. Any Gaussian unitary transformation $\hat{U}$ on Hilbert space can be represented by an affine symplectic transformation in mode space, i.e., by a *symplectic matrix* $\mathbf{S} \in \mathrm{Sp}(2m, \mathbb{R})$ followed by a phase-space *displacement* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ (see equation (26) in the Methods section), where the real symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}(2m, \mathbb{R})$ contains all real $2m \times 2m$ matrices that preserve the canonical phase-space commutation relations[42,43]. By virtue of the Euler decomposition[42,44], $\mathbf{S}$ can be implemented with single-mode squeezing operations and passive mode transformations. We denote the *maximum single-mode squeezing* of $\mathbf{S}$ by $s_{\max}$ and define the *mode range* $d \leq m$ to be the maximal number of input modes to which each output mode is coupled (for details see Section S1 of the SI). Also, it will be useful to define

$$\kappa := 2 \min\{d^2, m\}. \tag{9}$$

The displacement $\mathbf{x}$ can be implemented by a single-mode displacer at each mode $j \in [m]$, with amplitude $(x_{2j-1}, x_{2j})$, where $x_k$, for $k \in [2m]$, is the $k$-th component of $\mathbf{x}$. The *vector 2-norm* is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_2$, i.e., $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 := \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2m} x_k^2\right)^{1/2}$.

We take $\sigma_i$ to be a uniform upper bound on the variances of any product of $i$ *phase space quadratures* in the state $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$. If $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ is Gaussian, $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ are functions of the single mode squeezing parameters of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$. In addition, we call $\sigma_{\leq i} := \max_{k \leq i}\{\sigma_k\}$ the *maximal $i$-th variance* of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$. Finally, we use the Landau symbol O to denote asymptotic upper bounds.

**Box 1** (Certification test $\mathcal{T}$)**.**

1) *Arthur chooses a threshold fidelity $F_{\mathrm{T}} < 1$, a maximal failure probability $\alpha > 0$, and an estimation error $0 < \varepsilon \leq (1 - F_{\mathrm{T}})/2$.*
2) *Arthur provides Merlin with the classical specification $n$, $\mathbf{S}$, and $\mathbf{x}$ of the target state $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ and requests a sufficient number of copies of it.*
3) *If $n = 0$, Arthur measures $2m\kappa$ two-mode correlations and $2m$ single-mode expectation values specified by the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$ (see the Methods section), which can be done with $m + 3$ single-mode homodyne settings.*
   *If $n > 0$, he measures $\mathrm{O}\left(m(4d^2 + 1)^n\right)$ multi-body correlators, each one involving between 1 and $2n + 1$ modes, specified by the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ (see the Methods section), which can be done with at most $\binom{m}{n} 2^{n+1}$ single-mode homodyne settings.*
4) *By classical post-processing (see the Methods section), he obtains a fidelity estimate $F^{(n)*}$ such that $F^{(n)*} \in [F^{(n)} - \varepsilon, F^{(n)} + \varepsilon]$ with probability at least $1 - \alpha$, where $F^{(n)}$ is the lower bound to $F$ given by expression (8).*
5) *If $F^{(n)*} < F_{\mathrm{T}} + \varepsilon$, he rejects. Otherwise, he accepts.*

**Theorem 2** (Quantum certification of Gaussian states)**.** *Let $F_{\mathrm{T}} < 1$ be a threshold fidelity, $\alpha > 0$ a maximal failure probability, and $0 < \varepsilon \leq (1 - F_{\mathrm{T}})/2$ an estimation error. Let $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$ have maximum single-mode squeezing $s_{\max} \geq 1$, mode range $d \leq m$, and displacement $\mathbf{x}$. Test $\mathcal{T}$ from Box 1*

*is a certification test for $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ and requires at most*

$$\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{s_{\max}^4\left(2\sigma_1^2\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 m^3+\sigma_2^2\kappa^3 m^4\right)}{\varepsilon^2\ln(1/(1-\alpha))}\right) \tag{10}$$

*copies of a preparation $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ with first and second variance bounds $\sigma_1>0$ and $\sigma_2>0$, respectively.*

**Theorem 3** (Quantum certification of linear-optical network states)**.** *Let $F_{\mathrm{T}}<1$ be a threshold fidelity, $\alpha>0$ a maximal failure probability, and $0<\varepsilon\leq(1-F_{\mathrm{T}})/2$ an estimation error. Let $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ have mode range $d\leq m$. Test $\mathcal{T}$ from Box 1 is a certification test for $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ and requires at most*

$$\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{\sigma_{\leq 2(n+1)}^2 m^4(\lambda\, d^6\, n\, m)^n}{\varepsilon^2\ln(1/(1-\alpha))}\right) \tag{11}$$

*copies of a preparation $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ with maximal $2(n+1)$-th variance $\sigma_{\leq 2(n+1)}$, where $\lambda>0$ is an absolute constant.*

The proofs of all our theorems are provided in the SI. The treatments of the classes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ or $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ follow as corollaries of Theorems 2 and 3, respectively, and are also provided in the SI (see Section S2 D there). Expressions (10) and (11) are highly simplified upper bounds on the total number of copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ that $\mathcal{T}$ requires. For more precise expressions see Lemmas S7 and S10 of the SI. Note that neither of the two theorems requires any energy cut-off or phase-space truncation. While our bound (11) is inefficient in $n$, both for the Gaussian and linear-optical cases, the number of copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ scales polynomially with all other parameters, in particular with $m$. Thus, arbitrary $m$-mode target states from the classes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ with constant $n$, are certified by $\mathcal{T}$ efficiently.

Interestingly, since states in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ in general display negative Wigner functions, sampling from their measurement probability distributions cannot be efficiently done by the available classical sampling methods[46,47]. Furthermore, for Fock-state measurements, these distributions define BosonSampling, for which hardness results exist[48] for $m$ asymptotically lower-bounded by $n^5$.

Also, note that there are no restrictions on $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ except that, in practice, to apply the theorems, one needs bounds on $\sigma_1$, $\sigma_2$, and $\sigma_{\leq 2(n+1)}$. These variances are properties of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ and are therefore a priori unknown to Arthur. However, he can reasonably estimate them from his measurements. Note that, for random variables that can take any real value, assuming that the variances are bounded is a fundamental and unavoidable assumption to make estimations from samples; and it is one that can be contrasted with the measurement results.

To end up with, we consider certification in the robust sense of Fig. 1 (b):

**Definition 4** (Robust quantum state certification)**.** *Let $F_{\mathrm{T}}<1$ be a threshold fidelity, $\alpha>0$ a maximal failure probability, and $\Delta<1-F_{\mathrm{T}}$ a fidelity gap. A test, which takes as input a classical description of the target state $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ and copies of a preparation $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ and outputs "accept" or "reject" is a* robust certification test *for $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ if, with probability at least $1-\alpha$, it both rejects every $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ for which $F(\varrho_{\mathrm{t}},\varrho_{\mathrm{p}})<F_{\mathrm{T}}$ and accepts every $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ for which $F(\varrho_{\mathrm{t}},\varrho_{\mathrm{p}})\geq F_{\mathrm{T}}+\Delta$. We say that any $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ accepted by such a test is a* certified preparation *of $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$.*

This definition is more stringent than Definition 1 in that it guarantees that preparations sufficiently close to $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ are necessarily accepted, rendering the certification robust against state deviations with infidelities as large as $1-(F_{\mathrm{T}}+\Delta)$. We show below that our test $\mathcal{T}$ from Box 1 is actually a robust certification test.

To this end, we first write $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ as

$$\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}=F\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}+(1-F)\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}, \tag{12}$$

where $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}$ is an operator orthogonal to $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product, i.e., such that $\mathrm{Tr}[\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}\,\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}]=0$. As $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ is assumed to be pure, it follows immediately that $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}$ is actually a state. In fact, multiplying by $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ and taking the trace on both sides of equation (12), one readily sees that the decomposition (12) is just another way to express the fidelity (1). We define the *photon mismatch* $\tilde{n}^{\perp}$ between $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ and $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ as

$$\tilde{n}^{\perp}:=\langle(\hat{n}-n)\prod_{j=1}^{n}\hat{n}_j\rangle_{\hat{U}^{\dagger}\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}\hat{U}}. \tag{13}$$

The photon mismatch gives the expectation value that Arthur would obtain if he had access to $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}$, applied the inverse of Merlin's network to it, and then measured $(\hat{n}-n)\prod_{j=1}^{n}\hat{n}_j$. For the ideal case $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}=\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$, it clearly holds that $\tilde{n}^{\perp}=0$.

**Theorem 5** (Robust quantum certification)**.** *Under the same conditions as in Theorems 2 and 3, test $\mathcal{T}$ from Box 1 is a robust certification test with fidelity gap*

$$\Delta:=\max\left\{\frac{2\varepsilon+(1-F_{\mathrm{T}})(\tilde{n}^{\perp}-1)}{\tilde{n}^{\perp}},2\varepsilon\right\}, \tag{14}$$

*where $\tilde{n}^{\perp}$ is the photon mismatch.*

As expected, the gap cannot be smaller than twice the estimation error for any photon mismatch. Notice also that in the limit $\tilde{n}^{\perp}\to\infty$ it holds that $\Delta\to 1-F_{\mathrm{T}}$, so that the certification becomes less robust with increasing $\tilde{n}^{\perp}$. As $\tilde{n}^{\perp}$ decreases from infinity to one, the gap decreases to its minimal value $\Delta=2\varepsilon$, where it remains for all $0\leq\tilde{n}^{\perp}\leq 1$. We emphasise that $\tilde{n}^{\perp}$ depends on $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}$. Thus it cannot be directly estimated from measurements on $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ alone. However, for any $\tilde{n}^{\perp}<\infty$, Theorem 5 guarantees the existence of an entire region of states around $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ that are rightfully accepted. Furthermore, in the experimentally relevant situations, $\tilde{n}^{\perp}$ is expected to be small. In this case, Theorem 5 provides a lower bound on the size of the region of accepted states.

Finally, a statement equivalent to Theorem 5 for target states $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}\cup\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ follows as an immediate corollary of it and is presented in Section S2 E in the SI.

## Discussion

Large-scale photonic quantum technologies promise important scientific advances and technological applications. So

far, considerably more effort has been put into their realisation than into the verification of their correct functioning and reliability. This imposes a serious obstacle for further experimental advance, specifically in the light of the speed at which progress towards many-mode architectures takes place. Here, we have presented a practical reliable certification tool for a broad family of multi-mode bosonic quantum technologies.

We have proven theorems that upper-bound the number of experimental runs sufficient for our protocol to be a certification test. Our theorems provide large-deviation bounds from a simple extremality-based fidelity lower-bound that is interesting in its own right. Importantly, our theorems hold only for statistical errors, but the stability analyses on which they rely (see Lemmas S6 and S9 in the SI) holds regardless of the nature of the errors. As a matter of fact, in Section S5 in the SI, we show that our fidelity estimates are robust also against systematic errors.

From a more practical viewpoint, our test allows one to certify the state preparations of most current optical experiments, in both the "continuous-variable" and the "discrete-variable" setting. This is achieved under the minimal possible assumptions: namely, only that the variances of the measurement outcomes are finite. Thus, the certification is as unconditional as the fundamental laws of statistics allow. In particular, no assumption on the type of quantum noise is made. Despite the rigorous bounds on the estimation errors and failure probabilities, our methods are both experimentally friendly and resource efficient.

Notably, our test can for instance be applied to the certification of optical circuits of the type used in BosonSampling: There, $m$-mode Fock-basis states of $n$ photons are subjected to a linear-optical network described by a random unitary $\hat{U}$ drawn from the Haar measure[48] and, subsequently, each output mode is measured in the Fock basis. While the question of the certification of the classical outcomes of such samplers without assumptions on the device is still largely open[20,21], with the methods described here the pre-measurement non-Gaussian quantum outputs of BosonSampling devices[14–17] can be certified reliably and, for constant $n$, even efficiently. In this sense, this work goes significantly beyond previously proposed schemes to rule out particular cheating strategies by the prover[21–24]. Furthermore, a variety of non-Gaussian states paradigmatic in quantum optics and quantum information are also covered by our protocol (see Section S2 in the SI for details). These include, for instance, de-Gaussified photon-subtracted multi-mode Gaussian states[34–37], multi-mode squeezed Gaussian states post-selected through photon-number or quadrature measurements, as in finite-squeezing cluster-state qumode quantum computers[40,41], and linear-optical network outputs post-selected though photon-number measurements, ranging from photon -added or -subtracted linear-optical network states to all the states preparable with Knill-Laflamme-Milburn-like schemes[38,39]. For all such states, our test is efficient in the inverse post-selection success probability $1/\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})$.

The present method constitutes a step forward in the field of photonic quantum certification, with potential implications on the certification of other many-body quantum-information technologies. Apart from that of BosonSamplers and optical schemes with post-selection, the efficient and reliable certification of large-scale photonic networks as those used, for instance, for multi-mode Gaussian quantum-information processing[12,13], non-Gaussian Anderson-localisation simulations[18,19], and quantum metrology[1], with a constant number of input photons, is now within reach.

## Methods

**Fidelity lower bound**. In this section, we formalise the extremality notion and derive a lower bound on the fidelity $F$. All target states are of the form

$$\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} = \hat{U}\,|\mathbf{n}\rangle\langle\mathbf{n}|\,\hat{U}^{\dagger}, \tag{15}$$

where $\hat{U}$ is an arbitrary Gaussian unitary and $|\mathbf{n}\rangle$ an arbitrary Fock-basis state. First, we derive a general fidelity lower bound and then consider the linear-optical $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ and Gaussian $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$ cases separately. Analogous bounds for the post-selected target states are provided further below in the Measurement Scheme and Section S2 A of the SI.

We start recalling that

$$|\mathbf{n}\rangle = \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_j!}} (\hat{a}_j^{\dagger})^{n_j}\,|\mathbf{0}\rangle\,, \tag{16}$$

where $a_j^{\dagger}$ is the creation operator of the $j$-th mode. Its Hermitian conjugated $\hat{a}_j$ is the corresponding annihilation operator. These operators satisfy $[\hat{a}_j, \hat{a}_{j'}^{\dagger}] = \delta_{j,j'}$, where $\delta_{j,j'}$ denotes the *Kronecker delta* of $j$ and $j'$, and $\hat{n}_j = \hat{a}_j^{\dagger}\hat{a}_j$, for all $j, j' \in [m]$. The fidelity (1) can be written as $F = F(|\mathbf{n}\rangle\langle\mathbf{n}|\,, \tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p}})$, where $\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p}} := \hat{U}^{\dagger}\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}\hat{U}$ is the Heisenberg representation of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ with respect to $\hat{U}^{\dagger}$. With this, equation (16), and the cyclicality property of the trace, we obtain that

$$F = \mathrm{Tr}\left[|\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}|\,\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}\right] = F(|\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}|\,, \tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}), \tag{17}$$

where

$$\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}} := \prod_{j'=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_{j'}!}} (\hat{a}_{j'})^{n_{j'}}\,\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p}} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_j!}} (\hat{a}_j^{\dagger})^{n_j}. \tag{18}$$

To lower-bound $F(|\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}|\,, \tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}})$, we consider the average total photon-number $\langle\hat{n}\rangle_{\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}} := \mathrm{Tr}[\hat{n}\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}]$ of $\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}$. We write $\mathbb{1}$ for the *identity operator*. From the facts $\mathbb{1} - |\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}| \leq \hat{n}$ and $\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}} \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\hat{n}\rangle_{\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}} &= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sum_{\mathbf{n}} n\,|\mathbf{n}\rangle\langle\mathbf{n}|\,\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}\right] \\ &\geq \mathrm{Tr}\left[(\mathbb{1} - |\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}|)\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}\right] \\ &= 1 - F\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

and hence,

$$F \geq F^{(\mathbf{n})} \coloneqq 1 - \langle \hat{n} \rangle_{\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}}. \tag{20}$$

This bound justifies the natural extremality intuition mentioned: The lower the average number of photons of $\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p},\mathbf{n}}$ is, the closer to the vacuum it must be and, therefore, the closer $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ to $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$. Notice that, for $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}} = \varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$, the inequality in equation (19) becomes an equality and therefore bound (20) is saturated, as announced earlier.

Next, we define the operator valued Pochhammer-Symbol

$$p_t(\hat{n}_j) \coloneqq \hat{n}_j(\hat{n}_j - 1)(\hat{n}_j - 2)\cdots(\hat{n}_j - t), \tag{21}$$

for any integer $t \geq 0$, and $p_{-1}(x) \coloneqq \mathbb{1}$. In Section S6 A in the SI we show that

$$(\hat{a}_j^\dagger)^{n_j} \hat{n}_j (\hat{a}_j)^{n_j} = p_{n_j}(\hat{n}_j), \tag{22a}$$

and

$$(\hat{a}_j^\dagger)^{n_j} (\hat{a}_j)^{n_j} = p_{n_j-1}(\hat{n}_j). \tag{22b}$$

Inserting equation (18) into equation (20), using the cyclicity property of the trace, grouping the operators of each mode together, using equations (22) and that $p_t(\hat{n}_j) = p_{t-1}(\hat{n}_j)\,(\hat{n}_j - t)$, we obtain the general fidelity lower bound

$$F \geq F^{(\mathbf{n})} = 1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!}\left\langle (\hat{n} - n) \prod_{j=1}^{m} p_{n_j-1}(\hat{n}_j) \right\rangle_{\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p}}}, \tag{23}$$

where $\mathbf{n}! \coloneqq n_1! n_2! \ldots n_m!$. In order to specialise to the linear-optical case $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$, we simply take $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{1}_n$, i.e., $n_j = 1$ for all $j \in [n]$ and $n_j = 0$ otherwise. With this, $F^{(\mathbf{n})}$ in equation (23) simplifies to precisely the bound $F^{(n)}$ in equation (8). Finally, to restrict it to the Gaussian case $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$, we take $n_j = 0$ for all $j \in [m]$. This yields the particularly simple expression

$$F \geq F^{(0)} \coloneqq 1 - \langle \hat{n} \rangle_{\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p}}}. \tag{24}$$

Arthur does not have enough quantum capabilities to directly estimate $\langle \hat{n} \rangle_{\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p}}}$ by undoing the operation $\hat{U}$ on Merlin's outputs and then measuring $\hat{n}$ in the Fock state basis. However, we show in the next section that he can efficiently obtain $\langle \hat{n} \rangle_{\tilde{\varrho}_{\mathrm{p}}}$, as well as the expectation values in equations (23) and (8), from the results of single-mode homodyne measurements.

**Measurement scheme**. First, we introduce some notation. By $\hat{q}_j$ and $\hat{p}_j$ we denote, respectively, the conjugated position and momentum *phase-space quadrature operators* of the $j$-th mode in the canonical convention[42,43], i.e., with the commutation relations $[\hat{q}_j, \hat{p}_{j'}] = \mathrm{i}\,\delta_{j,j'}$. The *particle number operator* of the $j$-th mode can be written in terms of the phase-space quadratures as $\hat{n}_j = \hat{q}_j^2 + \hat{p}_j^2 - 1/2$. In addition, it will be convenient to group all quadrature operators into a $2m$-component column vector $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$, with elements

$$\hat{r}_{2j-1} \coloneqq \hat{q}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{r}_{2j} \coloneqq \hat{p}_j. \tag{25}$$

As already mentioned, the action of $\hat{U}$ on mode space is given by a symplectic matrix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathrm{Sp}(2m, \mathbb{R})$ and a displacement vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$. More precisely, under a Gaussian unitary $\hat{U}$, $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ transforms according to the affine linear map[42]

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}} \mapsto \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{r}} \hat{U} = \mathbf{S}\hat{\mathbf{r}} + \mathbf{x}. \tag{26}$$

Equivalently, the right-hand side of this equation defines the Heisenberg representation of $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ with respect to $\hat{U}$. In addition, it will be useful to denote the Heisenberg representation of $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ with respect to $\hat{U}^\dagger$ by $\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} \coloneqq \hat{U}\hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{U}^\dagger$. Thanks to equation (26), we can write $\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}$ in terms of the symplectic matrix $\mathbf{S}$ and displacement vector $\mathbf{x}$ that define $\hat{U}$, as

$$\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} = \mathbf{S}^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{x}). \tag{27}$$

The symbols $\hat{r}^2 \coloneqq \hat{\mathbf{r}}^T\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\hat{\tilde{r}}^2 \coloneqq \hat{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}^T\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}$ will represent, respectively, the scalar products of $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}$ with themselves. Also, we will use the same notation for the Heisenberg representations of each quadrature operator with respect to $\hat{U}^\dagger$, i.e., $\hat{\tilde{q}}_j \coloneqq \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{q}_j \hat{U}$ and $\hat{\tilde{p}}_j \coloneqq \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{p}_j \hat{U}$.

Next, for $\beta \in \{0, n, \mathbf{n}\}$, we express our fidelity bounds in the general form

$$F^{(\beta)} = 1 - \left\langle \hat{N}^{(\beta)} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}, \tag{28}$$

where $\hat{N}^{(\beta)}$ is an observable decomposed explicitly in terms of the local observables to which Arthur has access. We start with the Gaussian case $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$. To express the bound (24) as in equation (28), we first write the total photon-number operator as

$$\hat{n} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \hat{n}_j = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (\hat{q}_j^2 + \hat{p}_j^2 - \frac{1}{2}) = \hat{r}^2 - \frac{m}{2}. \tag{29}$$

This, in combination with equation (24), yields

$$\hat{N}^{(0)} \coloneqq \hat{\tilde{r}}^2 - \frac{m}{2}. \tag{30}$$

Note that, due to equation (27), each component of $\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}$ is a linear combination of at most $2m$ components of $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$. This implies that Arthur can obtain $\langle \hat{\tilde{r}}^2 \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$ by measuring at most $2m$ single-quadrature expectation values of the form $\langle \hat{r}_k \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$ and $4m^2$ *second moments* of the form $\Gamma^{(1)}_{k,k'} \coloneqq \langle \frac{1}{2}(\hat{r}_k \hat{r}_{k'} + \hat{r}_{k'} \hat{r}_k) \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$. He can then classically efficiently combine them as dictated by $\mathbf{S}$ and $\mathbf{x}$ in equation (27). In Section S1 A of the SI, we give the details of this measurement procedure, which we call $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$, and show that measuring $m\,\kappa$ second moments, instead of $4m^2$, is actually enough. Furthermore, in Section S4 A of the SI, we show that only $m + 3$ experimental settings suffice.

Now, proceeding in a similar fashion with the generic

bound (23), we obtain

$$\hat{N}^{(\mathbf{n})} := \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!}\Big(\hat{\tilde{r}}^2 - \frac{m+2n}{2}\Big)\prod_{j=1}^{m} p_{n_j-1}\Big(\hat{\tilde{q}}_j^2 + \hat{\tilde{p}}_j^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Big). \tag{31}$$

Note that the observable in equation (30) is contained as the special case $n = 0$. For target states in the class $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$, $\hat{U}$ is assumed to be a passive Gaussian unitary. Such unitaries preserve the area in phase space, i.e., if $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ it holds that $\hat{\tilde{r}}^2 = \hat{r}^2$ (for details, see Section S1 B in the SI). Hence, using this and specialising to the case $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{1}_n$, equation (31) simplifies to

$$\hat{N}^{(n)} := \Big(\hat{r}^2 - \frac{m+2n}{2}\Big)\prod_{j=1}^{n}\Big(\hat{\tilde{q}}_j^2 + \hat{\tilde{p}}_j^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Big). \tag{32}$$

Again by virtue of equation (27), Arthur can now obtain the expectation values of the observables in equations (31) and (32) by measuring $2j$*-th moments* of the form $\Gamma^{(j)}_{k_1,l_1,\ldots,k_j,l_j} := \langle \frac{1}{2^j}(\hat{r}_{k_1}\hat{r}_{l_1} + \hat{r}_{l_1}\hat{r}_{k_1})\cdots(\hat{r}_{k_j}\hat{r}_{l_j} + \hat{r}_{l_j}\hat{r}_{k_j})\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$ and then classically recombining them, which — for constant $n$ — he can do efficiently. In Section S1 B of the SI, we give the details of the measurement procedure to obtain $F^{(n)}$, which we call $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$. In particular, we show that, to obtain $\langle \hat{N}^{(n)}\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$, estimating a total of $\mathrm{O}\left(m(4d^2+1)^n\right)$ $2j$-th moments, with $j \in [n+1]$, is enough. Also, we list which moments are the relevant ones in terms of $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$. Furthermore, in Section S4 B of the SI, we show that only $\binom{m}{n}2^{n+1}$ experimental settings suffice.

Finally, in the SI, we derive a bound analogous to that of equations (28) with (31) for post-selected target states $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}$. More precisely, we show that the fidelity $F_{\mathcal{S}} := F(\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}, \varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}})$ between $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}$ and an arbitrary, unknown $(m-a)$-mode system preparation $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}$ is lower bounded as

$$F_{\mathcal{S}} \geq F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\mathbf{n})} = 1 - \left\langle \hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\mathbf{n})} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}}, \tag{33}$$

with

$$\hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\mathbf{n})} := \frac{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}) - 1 + \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!}\langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}\hat{N}^{(\mathbf{n})}|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}. \tag{34}$$

From this, the corresponding expressions for the classes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ an $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ follow, in turn, as the two particular cases $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{1}_n$ with $\hat{U}$ passive, respectively. See Section S2 A of the SI for details.

**Non-Gaussian state nullifiers**. It is instructive to mention that the operators

$$\hat{N}_j^{(0)} := \hat{\tilde{q}}_j^2 + \hat{\tilde{p}}_j^2 - 1/2, \tag{35}$$

for $j \in [m]$, correspond to the so-called *nullifiers* of the Gaussian states in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$. The nullifiers are commuting operators that, despite originally introduced[41] as a tool to define Gaussian graph states, can be tailored to define any pure Gaussian state[49,50]: If a state is the simultaneous null-eigenvalue eigenstate of all $m$ nullifiers of a given pure Gaussian state, then the former is necessarily equal to the latter. The bound $F^{(0)}$, given by equations (28) and (30), exploits the fact that if a preparation gives a sufficiently low expectation value for the sum $\hat{N}^{(0)} = \sum_{j=1}^{m}\hat{N}_j^{(0)}$ of all $m$ nullifiers then its fidelity with the target state must be high. A similar intuition has been previously exploited[12,13] to experimentally check for multimode entanglement of ultra-large Gaussian cluster states. Here, we can not only certify entanglement but the quantum state itself.

Analogously, in the non-Gaussian case, from the derivation of equation (31), we can identify the operator

$$\hat{N}_j^{(\mathbf{n})} := \left(\hat{\tilde{q}}_j^2 + \hat{\tilde{p}}_j^2 - \frac{1+2n_j}{2}\right)\prod_{k=1}^{m} p_{n_k-1}\left(\hat{\tilde{q}}_k^2 + \hat{\tilde{p}}_k^2 - 1/2\right) \tag{36}$$

as the $j$-th nullifier of the $m$-mode non-Gaussian state $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ of equation (15). Indeed, all $m$ observables given by equation (36) for all $j \in [m]$ commute and have $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ as their unique, simultaneous null-eigenvalue eigenstate. To end up with, due to the projection onto $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$, the equivalent observables for post-selected target states do not in general commute. Nevertheless, their sum, given by $\hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\mathbf{n})}$, still defines an observable with $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}$ as its unique null-eigenvalue eigenstate. These observables constitute, to our knowledge[42,49,50], the first examples of nullifiers for non-Gaussian states.


## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank F. G. S. L. Brandão and S. T. Flammia for discussions on certification of state preparation. We thank the EU (RAQUEL, SIQS, AQuS, REQS - Marie Curie IEF No 299141), the BMBF, the FQXI, the Studienstiftung des Deutschen Volkes, MPQ-ICFO, and FOQUS for support.


## Author Contributions

All four authors participated in all the discussions and contributed with insights. LA conceived the fidelity bound and its estimation technique. LA, CG, and MK carried out all the calculations and worked out the details of the formalism.

# Supplementary Information

In this Supplementary Information we present the technical details of the certification test and the proofs of the theorems. It is organised as follows: In Section S1 we provide a detailed description of the measurements schemes $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ for the classes of target states $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$, respectively. In particular, in Boxes S1 and S2 in that section, a full specification of the necessary correlators to measure is given. In Section S2, we extend Theorems 2 and 3 to the classes of post-selected target states $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$. Section S3 contains the proofs of our theorems, as well as of the Corollaries for post-selected target states. In particular, Lemmas S7 and S10 provide more precise expressions of the bounds (10) and (11) of the Theorems 2 and 3 in the main text. In Section S4 we upper-bound the number of experimental settings necessary for our measurement schemes. In Section S5 we analyse the stability of our fidelity estimates under systematic errors. Finally, Section S6 contains some auxiliary mathematical relations necessary for our treatments. Equation and theorem numbers that do not start with an upper case S refer to the respective equations and theorems of the main text.

## S1 The measurement scheme

In this section we elaborate on the fidelity bounds $F^{(0)}$ and $F^{(n)}$ of the fidelity bounds for the Gaussian and linear-optical case, respectively. To this end, it will be convenient to first specify some details of the symplectic matrix $\mathbf{S}$, which describes the optical network.

By virtue of the Euler decomposition[42,44], $\mathbf{S}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{O}\,\mathbf{D}\,\mathbf{O}', \tag{S1}$$

where $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m\times 2m}$ is positive-definite and diagonal, with elements $D_{2j-1,2j-1} \coloneqq s_j \geq 1$ and $D_{2j,2j} \coloneqq s_j^{-1}$, for $j \in [m]$, and $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m\times 2m}$ and $\mathbf{O}' \in \mathbb{R}^{2m\times 2m}$ are orthogonal matrices. $\mathbf{D}$ describes $m$ active single-mode squeezers in parallel, each one with squeezing parameter $s_j$ along the position quadrature. The maximum single-mode squeezing is $s_{\max} \coloneqq \max_{1\leq j\leq m}\{s_j\}$. $\mathbf{O}$ and $\mathbf{O}'$, in turn, describe passive mode transformations that can be implemented by linear-optical networks of at most $m(m-1)/2$ beam-splitters and single-mode phase shifters[45]. In the two settings considered here, i.e., for any $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}} \cup \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$, the unitary $\hat{U}$ in equations (4) and (5) is such that $\mathbf{O}'$ can be taken as the identity matrix. In the first setting, i.e., for $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$, this holds because $\hat{U}$ acts on the vacuum state vector $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and any passive mode transformation maps the vacuum into itself. For the second setting, i.e., for $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$, this holds simply because there we assume that the total transformation itself is passive, i.e., in that case it holds also that $\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{1}$, so that $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{O}$.

In both cases, coupling between different modes only takes place through the linear-optical network described by $\mathbf{O}$. A general circuit can couple all $m$ modes with each other, meaning that the quadrature operators of each output mode are linear combinations of those of all $m$ input modes. However, often, each mode is only coupled to at most $d \leq m$ other modes. In these situations, $\mathbf{O}$ is a sparse matrix with at most $4md$ non-zero elements. More precisely, the columns of $\mathbf{O}$ are given by $2m$ orthonormal vectors $(\mathbf{o}^{(k)})_{k\in[2m]}$ each having at most $2d$ non-zero entries. Furthermore, since the position and momentum of each mode is coupled to at most the $2d$ quadratures of the same $d$ modes, each pair $\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)}$ and $\mathbf{o}^{(2j)}$ shares the same *sparsity property*, i.e., $\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)}$ and $\mathbf{o}^{(2j)}$ have at least $2(m-d)$ zero entries in common, for all $j \in [m]$.

### S1.A Gaussian case

Using that in the Gaussian case $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{O}\,\mathbf{D}$ and squaring equation (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{r}^2 &= \hat{\mathbf{r}}^T\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{r}} - 2\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{r}} + \mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^{-1}\mathbf{x}\\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T[\hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T - (2\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}^T]\right],\end{aligned} \tag{S2}$$

where $\mathbf{O}^{-1} = \mathbf{O}^T$ has been used and the trace is taken not over the Hilbert space but over the $2m \times 2m$ matrix with operators as entries. Combining equations (S2), (28), and (30) yields

$$F^{(0)} = 1 - \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T[\langle\hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}} - (2\langle\hat{\mathbf{r}}\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}} - \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}^T]\right] + \frac{m}{2}. \tag{S3}$$

Now we introduce the *first moment vector* $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ and the symmetric *second moment matrix* $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m\times 2m}$ of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$, with components

$$\gamma_l \coloneqq \langle\hat{r}_l\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^{(1)}_{l,l'} \coloneqq \left\langle \frac{\hat{r}_l\hat{r}_{l'} + \hat{r}_{l'}\hat{r}_l}{2}\right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}, \tag{S4}$$

**Box S1** (Measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$)**.**
*1) For each $1 \leq l \leq 2m$ Arthur uses $C_1$ copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$, with $C_1$ given by equation (S56a), to measure the observable $\hat{r}_l$, obtaining an estimate $\gamma_l^*$ of the expectation value $\gamma_l = \langle \hat{r}_l \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$.*
*2) For each $1 \leq l \leq l' \leq 2m$ for which $(\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^{-1})_{l,l'} = \sum_{k=1}^{2m} o_l^{(k)} D_{k,k}^{-2} o_{l'}^{(k)} \neq 0$, Arthur uses $C_2$ copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$, with $C_2$ given by equation (S56b), to measure the observable $\frac{1}{2}(\hat{r}_l \hat{r}_{l'} + \hat{r}_{l'} \hat{r}_l)$, obtaining an estimate $\Gamma_{l,l'}^{(1)*}$ of the expectation values $\Gamma_{l,l'}^{(1)} = \Gamma_{l',l}^{(1)}$ in equation (S4).*
*3) He obtains the estimate $F^{(0)*}$ of $F^{(0)}$ by replacing in equation (S6) the actual expectation values $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ by the estimates $\Gamma^{(1)*}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$, respectively.*

respectively. Since the matrix $\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T$ is symmetric, it holds that

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T[\langle \hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}\right] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T[\langle \hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}^T\right], \tag{S5}$$

so that we can rewrite equation (S3) in terms of the observables which Arthur has access to as

$$F^{(0)} = 1 - \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^{-1}[\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)} - (2\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}^T]\right] + \frac{m}{2}. \tag{S6}$$

We will show later (see Lemma S5 in Section S3 C and the discussion immediately after its proof) that the bound (S6) actually depends on at most $2m\kappa$ out of the $4m^2$ entries of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$, with $\kappa = 2\min\{d^2, m\}$, as defined in equation (9). Thus, only the $2m\kappa$ corresponding observables, and the $2m$ observables necessary for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, as indicated in Box S1, need to be measured. All these observables can be measured by homodyne detection[42]. Furthermore, in Section S4 A we show that only $m+3$ different measurement settings are required. Finally, by classical post-processing, Arthur recombines his estimates according to the third step of Box S1 and obtains the fidelity estimate $F^{(0)*}$. This last step is also efficient in $m$.

### S1.B Linear-optical case

For $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ the unitary $\hat{U}$ is assumed to be passive. Hence, one has $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{O}$, and it follows that

$$\hat{\tilde{r}}^2 = \hat{r}^2\,. \tag{S7}$$

The components of $\tilde{r}$ are

$$\hat{\tilde{q}}_j = \mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)^T}\hat{\mathbf{r}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\tilde{p}}_j = \mathbf{o}^{(2j)^T}\hat{\mathbf{r}}, \tag{S8}$$

where $\mathbf{o}^{(k)}$ denotes the $k$-th column of $\mathbf{O}$. Defining

$$\mathbf{P}^{(j)} := \mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)}\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)^T} + \mathbf{o}^{(2j)}\mathbf{o}^{(2j)^T} \tag{S9}$$

as the projector onto the subspace spanned by the two vectors $\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)}$ and $\mathbf{o}^{(2j)}$ and using equations (S8), (28), and (32), we obtain

$$F^{(n)} = 1 - \left\langle \left(\hat{r}^2 - \frac{m+2n}{2}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T\mathbf{P}^{(j)}\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}. \tag{S10}$$

Next, we consider the $\binom{n}{j}$ subsets of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ of length $j$ and define $\Omega_\mu^{(j)}$ as the $\mu$-th of these subsets for some arbitrary ordering. With this, we expand the product inside equation (S10) as

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n}\left(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T\mathbf{P}^{(j)}\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \frac{1}{2}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{n}(-1/2)^{n-j}\sum_{\mu=1}^{\binom{n}{j}}\bigotimes_{i\in\Omega_\mu^{(j)}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T\mathbf{P}^{(i)}\hat{\mathbf{r}}. \tag{S11}$$

**Box S2** (Measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$)**.**
*1) For each* $1 \leq j \leq n$*, each* $1 \leq \mu \leq \binom{n}{j}$*, and each* $1 \leq k_1, l_1, k_2, l_2, \ldots, k_j, l_j \leq 2m$*, for which*

$$\Big( \bigotimes_{i \in \Omega_\mu^{(j)}} \mathbf{P}^{(i)} \Big)_{k_1, l_1, k_2, l_2, \ldots, k_j, l_j} \neq 0, \tag{S16}$$

*2) Arthur uses* $C_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ *copies of* $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$*, with* $C_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ *given by equation (S78), to measure the observable* $(\hat{r}_{k_1}\hat{r}_{l_1} + \hat{r}_{l_1}\hat{r}_{k_1})/2 \cdots (\hat{r}_{k_j}\hat{r}_{l_j} + \hat{r}_{l_j}\hat{r}_{k_j})/2$*, obtaining an estimate* ${\Gamma^{(j)*}}_{k_1, l_1, k_2, l_2, \ldots, k_j, l_j}$ *of the* $2j$*-th moment* $\Gamma^{(j)}_{k_1, l_1, k_2, l_2, \ldots, k_j, l_j}$*. For each* $1 \leq k_{j+1} \leq 2m$*, he uses* $C_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ *copies of* $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ *to measure the observable* $((\hat{r}_{k_1}\hat{r}_{l_1} + \hat{r}_{l_1}\hat{r}_{k_1})/2) \cdots ((\hat{r}_{k_j}\hat{r}_{l_j} + \hat{r}_{l_j}\hat{r}_{k_j})/2)\hat{r}^2_{k_{j+1}}$*, obtaining an estimate* ${\Gamma^{(j+1)*}}_{k_1, l_1, k_2, l_2, \ldots, k_j, l_j, k_{j+1}, k_{j+1}}$ *of the* $2(j+1)$*-th moment* $\Gamma^{(j+1)}_{k_1, l_1, k_2, l_2, \ldots, k_j, l_j, k_{j+1}, k_{j+1}}$*.*
*3) He obtains the estimate* $F^{(\mathbf{n})*}$ *of* $F^{(n)}$ *by replacing in equation (S15) for all* $1 \leq j \leq n+1$ *the actual expectation values* $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)}$ *by the estimates* $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)*}$*.*

Using that a product of traces can be written as a trace over tensor products, equation (S10) can be written as

$$F^{(n)} = 1 - \left\langle (\hat{r}^2 - \frac{m+2n}{2}) \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1/2)^{n-j} \sum_{\mu=1}^{\binom{n}{j}} \mathrm{Tr}\left[ \Big( \bigotimes_{i \in \Omega_\mu^{(j)}} \mathbf{P}^{(i)} \Big) (\hat{\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{r}}^T)^{\otimes j} \right] \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}, \tag{S12}$$

where $\bigotimes_{i \in \Omega_\mu^{(0)} = \emptyset} \mathbf{P}^{(i)} := 1$ and the traces are again taken not over the Hilbert space but over tensors that have operators as components. For each $j \in [n+1]$, we introduce the $2j$*-th moment tensors* $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)} \in (\mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m})^{\otimes j}$ with components

$$\Gamma^{(j)}_{k_1, l_1, \ldots, k_j, l_j} := \left\langle \frac{\hat{r}_{k_1}\hat{r}_{l_1} + \hat{r}_{l_1}\hat{r}_{k_1}}{2} \cdots \frac{\hat{r}_{k_j}\hat{r}_{l_j} + \hat{r}_{l_j}\hat{r}_{k_j}}{2} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}} \tag{S13}$$

and define $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(0)} := 1$. Clearly, these tensors are invariant under the partial transposition with respect to any $j'$-th pair of subindices $k_{j'}$ and $l_{j'}$,

$$\Gamma^{(j)}_{k_1, l_1, \ldots, k_{j'}, l_{j'}, \ldots, k_j, l_j} = \Gamma^{(j)}_{k_1, l_1, \ldots, l_{j'}, k_{j'}, \ldots, k_j, l_j}. \tag{S14}$$

With the definition (S13) and the fact that each projector $\mathbf{P}^{(i)}$ is a symmetric matrix, equation (S12) finally becomes

$$F^{(n)} = 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1/2)^{n-j} \sum_{\mu=1}^{\binom{n}{j}} \left\{ \mathrm{Tr}\left[ \Big( \mathbb{1} \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in \Omega_\mu^{(j)}} \mathbf{P}^{(i)} \Big) \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j+1)} \right] - \frac{m+2n}{2} \mathrm{Tr}\left[ \Big( \bigotimes_{i \in \Omega_\mu^{(j)}} \mathbf{P}^{(i)} \Big) \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)} \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}} \right] \right\}. \tag{S15}$$

Note that this is an explicit expression for $F^{(n)}$ in terms of the correlators (S13) that Arthur can measure. Due to the sparsity of $\mathbf{O}$, each matrix $\mathbf{P}^{(i)}$ has at most $(2d)^2$ non-zero entries. Then, it follows (see Lemma S8 in Section S3 D for details) that the measurement of $\mathrm{O}\left(m\left(4d^2+1\right)^n\right)$ observables, those listed in Box S2, suffices for the estimation of (S15). As in the Gaussian case, all these observables can be measured by homodyne detection[42]. Furthermore, in Section S4 B we show that at most $\binom{m}{n} 2^{n+1} \leq (2m)^n/n!$ measurement settings are sufficient. Once again, by classical post-processing, Arthur recombines his estimates according to the third step of Box S2 and obtains the fidelity estimate $F^{(n)*}$. Provided that $n$ is constant, this last step is also efficient in $m$.

## S2 Quantum certification of locally post-selected target states

In this section, we extend our results to locally post-selected $(m-a)$-mode target states $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ or $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$. The entire treatment of the classes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ or $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ is similar to, and follows directly from, that already seen for the classes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$ or $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$. Therefore, instead of repeating all the details, we simply explain the specific differences.

**Box S3** (Certification test $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{LPS}}$)**.**
*1) Idem as in $\mathcal{T}$ from Box 1.*
*2) Arthur provides Merlin with the classical specification $n$, $\mathbf{S}$, $\mathbf{x}$, $a$, and $|\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ of the target state $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}$ and requests a sufficient number of copies of it.*
*3) If $n = 0$, Arthur measures $2m\kappa$ two-mode correlations and $2(m-a)$ single-mode expectation values specified by the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ (see Section S2 C), which can be done with $m-a+3$ single-mode homodyne settings. If $n > 0$, he measures $\mathrm{O}\left(m(4d^2+1)^n\right)$ multi-body correlators, each one involving between 1 and $2n+1$ modes, specified by the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ (see Section S2 C), which can be done with at most $\binom{m}{n}2^{n+1}$ single-mode homodyne settings.*
*4) By classical post-processing, he obtains a fidelity estimate $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*}$ such that $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*} \in [{F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)} - \varepsilon, {F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)} + \varepsilon]$ with probability at least $1-\alpha$, where ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$ is the lower bound to $F_{\mathcal{S}}$ given by equation (S20).*
*5) If $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*} < F_{\mathrm{T}} + \varepsilon$, he rejects. Otherwise, he accepts.*

## S2.A The fidelity bound

The first step is to derive the fidelity bound $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ given by equation (33). We proceed in a similar fashion to the Methods Section in the main text. Due to equations (1) and (3), the facts that $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}$ and $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ are pure, and the properties of the trace, it holds that

$$F_{\mathcal{S}} = F(\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}, \varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}\left[\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}}\left[\frac{\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\langle\phi|_{\mathcal{A}})}{\mathbb{P}(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}\right]\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}\right] = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\left[\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}(\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\langle\phi|_{\mathcal{A}})\right]}{\mathbb{P}(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})} = \frac{F\left(\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}, \varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\langle\phi|_{\mathcal{A}}\right)}{\mathbb{P}(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}, \tag{S17}$$

where $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}$ indicates partial trace over the Fock space of the $m-a$ modes in $\mathcal{S}$. Now, due to equation (28), it holds that

$$F\left(\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}, \varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\langle\phi|_{\mathcal{A}}\right) \geq 1 - \mathrm{Tr}\left[\hat{N}^{(\mathbf{n})}(\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}} \otimes |\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\langle\phi|_{\mathcal{A}})\right] = 1 - \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}\left[\langle\phi|_{\mathcal{A}}\hat{N}^{(\mathbf{n})}|\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\,\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}\right], \tag{S18}$$

with $\hat{N}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ the observable of equation (31). Using equations (S17) and (S18), we obtain the general fidelity bound $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\mathbf{n})}$ of equation (33).

In particular, setting $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$ in equations (33) and (34) yields the specialized fidelity bound ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(0)} \geq 1 - \left\langle \hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(0)} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}}$ for the case $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$, with

$$\hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(0)} := \frac{\mathbb{P}(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}) - 1 + \langle\phi|_{\mathcal{A}}\hat{N}^{(0)}|\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}}{\mathbb{P}(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}, \tag{S19}$$

where $\hat{N}^{(0)}$ is the observable of equation (30) and $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ is the $m$-mode state in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{G}}$ associated with $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}$ through equation (3). Analogously, taking $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{1}_n$ and $\hat{U}$ passive yields the corresponding fidelity bound ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)} \geq 1 - \left\langle \hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}}$ for $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$, with

$$\hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)} := \frac{\mathbb{P}(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}) - 1 + \langle\phi|_{\mathcal{A}}\hat{N}^{(n)}|\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}}{\mathbb{P}(\phi_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}, \tag{S20}$$

where $\hat{N}^{(n)}$ is the observable from equation (31) and $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ is the $m$-mode state in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ associated to $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{t}}}$ through equation (3).

## S2.B The certification test

Next, in Box S3, we present a test $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{LPS}}$ that works for post-selected target states in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ or $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ and which is a slightly modified version of the test $\mathcal{T}$ from Box 1. It is, of course, possible to unify both tests so as to account for all four classes of target states in one single test. We have however opted for splitting the tests into the two cases with and without post-selection to avoid an excessive notational overhead in Box 1 of the main text.

### S2.C The measurement scheme

The measurement schemes $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ to estimate ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(0)}$ and ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$, respectively, are essentially replicas of the schemes $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ to estimate $F^{(0)}$ and $F^{(n)}$, already described in detail in boxes S1 and S2. Thus, instead of repeating all the details of boxes S1 and S2, we simply outline the concrete differences between $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$, as well as between $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$. There are only three specific differences.

1. The moment vector and tensors are now defined with respect to $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}} \otimes |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ instead of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$. More precisely, we now need to estimate the vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ and tensors $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(j)} \in \left(\mathbb{R}^{2m\times 2m}\right)^{\otimes j}$, with elements

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{S}l} \coloneqq \langle \hat{r}_l \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}\otimes|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}} = \langle \langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}} \hat{r}_l |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}} = \begin{cases} \langle \phi_l|_{\mathcal{A}_l} \hat{r}_l |\phi_l\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_l} & , \text{ if } l \in \mathcal{A}, \\ \langle \hat{r}_l \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}} & , \text{ if } l \notin \mathcal{A}, \end{cases} \tag{S21}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} {\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}^{(j)}}_{k_1,l_1,\ldots,k_j,l_j} &\coloneqq \left\langle \frac{\hat{r}_{k_1}\hat{r}_{l_1}+\hat{r}_{l_1}\hat{r}_{k_1}}{2} \cdots \frac{\hat{r}_{k_j}\hat{r}_{l_j}+\hat{r}_{l_j}\hat{r}_{k_j}}{2} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}\otimes|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}} \\ &= \left\langle \langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}} \frac{\hat{r}_{k_1}\hat{r}_{l_1}+\hat{r}_{l_1}\hat{r}_{k_1}}{2} \cdots \frac{\hat{r}_{k_j}\hat{r}_{l_j}+\hat{r}_{l_j}\hat{r}_{k_j}}{2} |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}}, \end{aligned} \tag{S22}$$

respectively.

2. ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(0)}$ and ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$ are obtained dividing the expressions on the right-hand sides of equations (S6) and (S15) by $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})$, and with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(j)}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(j)}$, respectively.

3. The presence of the divisor $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})$ in ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(0)}$ and ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$ is the reason for the third difference. As discussed in Lemmas S12 and S15 in Sections S3 E and S3 F, respectively, this divisor makes ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(0)}$ and ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$ $1/\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})$ times more unstable than $F^{(0)}$ and $F^{(n)}$. As a consequence, the number of copies of $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}$ required to estimate each relevant moment of ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(0)}$ are $\frac{C_1}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}$ and $\frac{C_2}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}$, instead of $C_1$ and $C_2$. This is summarized in Lemma S13. Analogously, the number required for each relevant moment of ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$ is $\frac{C_{\leq 2(n+1)}}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}$, instead of $C_{\leq 2(n+1)}$. This is summarized in Lemma S16.

As is clear from equations (S21) and (S22), the estimation of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(j)}$ requires only the measurement of multi-body correlators among the $(m-a)$ system modes in $\mathcal{S}$. This is due to the facts that after post selection the system is in a product state with respect to the bipartition in $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ and that the quadrature operators in equation (S22) can also be correspondingly grouped into two factors, one containing exclusively operators of modes in $\mathcal{S}$ and the other in $\mathcal{A}$. Furthermore, since $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a product state known to Arthur, he can efficiently calculate the expectation vale of any product of quadrature operators of modes in $\mathcal{A}$ with respect to $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$. For instance, suppose that $k_1, l_1, k_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and that $l_2, k_3, l_3 \ldots, k_j, l_j \notin \mathcal{A}$. Then, the corresponding $2j$-th moment decomposes as

$${\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}^{(j)}}_{k_1,l_1,\ldots,k_j,l_j} = \langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}} \frac{\hat{r}_{k_1}\hat{r}_{l_1}+\hat{r}_{l_1}\hat{r}_{k_1}}{2} \hat{r}_{k_2} |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \left\langle \hat{r}_{l_2} \frac{\hat{r}_{k_3}\hat{r}_{l_3}+\hat{r}_{l_3}\hat{r}_{k_3}}{2} \cdots \frac{\hat{r}_{k_j}\hat{r}_{l_j}+\hat{r}_{l_j}\hat{r}_{k_j}}{2} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}}, \tag{S23}$$

and only the measurement of the $(2j-3)$-th moment given by the second factor of equation (S23) is required. As another example, consider the case where a given $|\phi_j\rangle_{\mathcal{A}_j}$ is a Fock-basis state. Then, all the moments containing an odd number of quadrature operators of the $\mathcal{A}_j$-th mode automatically vanish and need therefore not be measured at all.

In general, Arthur can always efficiently obtain $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and the $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(j)}$'s as a product of an (a priori known) expectation value with respect to $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ of a multi-body product of quadrature operators of modes in $\mathcal{A}$ and a (measured) expectation value with respect to $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}$ of a multi-body product of quadrature operators of modes in $\mathcal{S}$, in a way analogous to the example of equation (S23).

### S2.D Corollaries of Theorems 2 and 3

Since the moments to be estimated are now given, in equations (S21) and (S22), by expectation values with respect to $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}} \otimes |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}$, instead of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$, a simple way to extend Theorems 2 and 3 to target states in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ or $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ is by redefining the variance upper bounds $\sigma_i$. More precisely, taking $\sigma_i$ as an upper bound on the variances of any product of $i$ phase space

quadratures now in the state $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{p}}$, we introduce the quantities

$$\varsigma_i \coloneqq \max_{j\in[a]\wedge k_1,k_2,\ldots k_j\in\mathcal{A}} \left\{ \langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}\, \hat{r}_{k_1}\hat{r}_{k_2}\ldots\hat{r}_{k_j}\, |\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\, \sigma_{i-j} \right\}, \tag{S24}$$

for $i \in [2(n+1)]$. In addition, we call $\varsigma_{\leq i} \coloneqq \max_{k\leq i}\{\varsigma_k\}$ the *maximal $i$-th generalised variance* of $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{p}}$.

The parameters $\varsigma_i$ quantify the maximal variances of random variables defined by products of $i-j$ quadrature-measurement outcomes on $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{p}}$ renormalised by the expectation value of products of $j$ quadrature operators with respect to $|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$, therefore automatically accounting for factorisations of the type of equation (S23). They constitute very non-tight upper bounds to the real variances. In particular experimental situations, tighter bounds can be found. Here, we are simply interested in taking advantage of the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 without introducing too much extra notational overhead, for which the definition of equation (S24) is enough. Indeed, with these redefinitions, the following corollaries follow straightforwardly from Theorems 2 and 3.

**Corollary S1** (Quantum certification of locally post-selected Gaussian states)**.** *Under the same conditions and for the same $\varrho_\mathrm{t}$ as in Theorem 2, test $\mathcal{T}_{LPS}$ from Box S3 is a certification test for $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ and requires at most*

$$\mathrm{O}\left( \frac{s_{\max}^4 \left(2\varsigma_1^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 m^3 + \varsigma_2^2 \kappa^3 m^4\right)}{\left[\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})\,\varepsilon\right]^2 \ln(1/(1-\alpha))} \right) \tag{S25}$$

*copies of a preparation $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{p}}$ with first and second generalized variance bounds $\varsigma_1 > 0$ and $\varsigma_2 > 0$, respectively.*

**Corollary S2** (Quantum certification of locally post-selected linear-optical network states)**.** *Under the same conditions and for the same $\varrho_\mathrm{t}$ as in Theorem 3, test $\mathcal{T}_{LPS}$ from Box S3 is a certification test for $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ and requires at most*

$$\mathrm{O}\left( \frac{\varsigma_{\leq 2(n+1)}^2 m^4 (\lambda\, d^6\, n\, m)^n}{\left[\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})\,\varepsilon\right]^2 \ln(1/(1-\alpha))} \right) \tag{S26}$$

*copies of a preparation $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{p}}$ with maximal $2(n+1)$-th generalised variance $\varsigma_{\leq 2(n+1)}$, where $\lambda > 0$ is the same absolute constant as in Theorem 3.*

Corollary S1 is proven in Section S3 E and Corollary S2 in Section S3 F. Equations (S25) and (S26) correspond to exactly the same expressions as in equations (10) and (11), respectively, with the replacements $\sigma \to \varsigma$ and $\varepsilon \to \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})\,\varepsilon$. The rescaling of $\varepsilon$ with the factor $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})$ originates directly from the new expression for the fidelity given in equation (S17). As mentioned in Section S2 C, this makes the fidelity bounds ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(0)}$ and ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$ more unstable than $F^{(0)}$ and $F^{(n)}$, leading to the error rescaling discussed earlier. In most interesting cases, the post-selection success probability $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})$ turns out to be exponentially small in $a$. Moreover, one can always come up with families of target states and post selection procedures for which $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})$ decreases arbitrarily fast in $m$. In such cases, the scalings in equations (S25) and (S26) are not efficient in $m$, inheriting the inefficiency of the state preparation by local measurements and post selection. However, both bounds are efficient in $1/\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})$. That is, in every practical situation where state preparation via post selection is feasible, so is state certification. Interestingly, even for families of target states and post selection procedures for which $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})$ decays exponentially in $a$, the overall scaling (of both bounds) with $a$ is better than the scalings (of the bounds in equations (11) and (S26)) with $n$. Indeed, the bound in equation (S26) grows, just like the bound in equation (11), faster than exponentially in $n$. Finally, both bounds (S25) and (S26) scale polynomially with all the other relevant parameters, including $1/\varepsilon$. Thus, arbitrary $m$-mode target states from the classes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$, with constant $n$, are certified by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{LPS}}$ efficiently in $m$, $1/\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})$, and all the other relevant parameters.

### S2.E Corollary of Theorem 5

Finally, it is possible to show that our certification test is robust also for the locally post-selected target states of the classes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}}$ or $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$. Writing $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{p}}$ as

$$\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{p}} = F_{\mathcal{S}}\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}} + (1-F_{\mathcal{S}})\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}, \tag{S27}$$

where $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}$ is such that $\mathrm{Tr}[\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}}\,\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}] = 0$, and introducing the *generalised photon mismatch* $\tilde{n}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\perp}$ between $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}}$ and $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{p}}$ as

$$\tilde{n}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\perp} \coloneqq \left\langle \frac{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t}) - 1 + (\hat{n}-n)\prod_{j=1}^{n}\hat{n}_j}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_\mathrm{t})} \right\rangle_{\hat{U}^\dagger \varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}\otimes|\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}\langle\boldsymbol{\phi}|_{\mathcal{A}}\hat{U}} = \left\langle \hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)} \right\rangle_{\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}}, \tag{S28}$$

where $\hat{N}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)}$ is the same observable as in (S20), the following holds true.

**Corollary S3** (Robust quantum certification of locally post-selected states)**.** *Under the same conditions as in Corollaries S1 and S2, test $\mathcal{T}$ from Box 1 is a robust certification test for $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSG}} \cup \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LPSLO}}$ with fidelity gap*

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \coloneqq \max\left\{\frac{2\varepsilon + (1-F_\mathrm{T})(\tilde{n}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\perp}-1)}{\tilde{n}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\perp}}, 2\varepsilon\right\}, \tag{S29}$$

*where $\tilde{n}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\perp}$ is the generalised photon mismatch.*

The proof is identical to the proof of Theorem 5 presented in Section S3 G but with the replacements $F \to F_{\mathcal{S}}$, $F^{(n)} \to {F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$, $F^{(n)*} \to F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*}$, $\Delta \to \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$, and $\tilde{n}^{\perp} \to \tilde{n}_{\mathcal{S}}^{\perp}$.

## S3 Proofs of the theorems and corollaries

Before going to the proofs, we devote two sections to establish necessary notation, review some known facts, and prove a general lemma.

### S3.A Norms

Here, we introduce some helpful notation used in the proofs and review a few facts about norms on finite dimensional vector spaces. The *max norm* $\|\cdot\|_{\max}$ of a tensor is the largest of the absolute values of its entries. For a matrix $\mathbf{A}$, for example, $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\max} \coloneqq \max_{k,l}|A_{k,l}|$. For $p \in [1,\infty]$, we denote the *vector $p$-norm* of a vector $\mathbf{a}$ by $\|\mathbf{a}\|_p$ and the *Schatten $p$-norm* of a matrix $\mathbf{A}$ by $\|\mathbf{A}\|_p$, which is defined to be the vector $p$-norm of the vector of its singular values. For any matrix $\mathbf{A}$, we define $\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{A})$ to be a vector containing all the entries of $\mathbf{A}$ (in some order). Then one can see that

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 = \|\operatorname{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_2 \tag{S30}$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\max} = \|\operatorname{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_\infty. \tag{S31}$$

For the vector and Schatten $p$-norm of vectors with $N$ elements and $N \times N$ matrices, respectively, the following inequalities hold

$$\|\cdot\|_1 \leq \sqrt{N}\|\cdot\|_2 \leq N\|\cdot\|_\infty. \tag{S32}$$

Because the Schatten $\infty$-norm is induced by the vector 2-norm, i.e.,

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty = \sup_{\mathbf{y}} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2}, \tag{S33}$$

it follows that for any two vectors $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ and $\mathbf{x}$

$$\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\mathbf{x}^T\|_\infty \leq \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_2\|\mathbf{x}\|_2. \tag{S34}$$

### S3.B Reliable estimation of expectation values from samples

We continue by proving a general large-deviation bound for estimates of expectation values from a finite number of measurements on independent copies, which we need for the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3.

**Lemma S4** (Reliable estimation of multiple expectation values from samples)**.** *Let $\sigma > 0$, $\rho$ be a state, and let $\hat{A}_1, \ldots, \hat{A}_N$ be observables with expectation values $A_i \coloneqq \mathrm{Tr}[\rho\hat{A}_i]$ and variances bounded as $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho\hat{A}_i^2] - A_i^2 \leq \sigma^2$. For each $i \in [N]$ and $\chi$, let $X_i^{(\chi)}$ be the random variable given by the measurement statistics of $\hat{A}_i$ on state $\rho$; such that, in particular, the $(X_i^{(\chi)})_{i,\chi}$ are independent random variables and the* finite sample average *over $c$ measurements of $\hat{A}_i$ is the random variable*

$$A_i^* \coloneqq \frac{1}{c}\sum_{\chi=1}^{c} X_i^{(\chi)}. \tag{S35}$$

*Then, the* $\{A_i^*\}_i$ *are independent and, for every* $\epsilon > 0$ *and* $\overline{\alpha} \in [1/2, 1)$*, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}\big[\forall i : \ |A_i^* - A_i| \leq \varepsilon\big] \geq \overline{\alpha} \tag{S36}$$

*whenever*

$$c \geq \frac{\sigma^2(N+1)}{\varepsilon^2 \ln(1/\overline{\alpha})}. \tag{S37}$$

*Proof.* The sample averages $\{A_i^*\}_i$ are independent by definition. By Chebyshev's inequality it holds that

$$\forall i \in [c] : \quad \mathbb{P}\big[|A_i^* - A_i| > \varepsilon\big] < \frac{\sigma^2}{c\varepsilon^2}. \tag{S38}$$

Since the $\{A_i^*\}_i$ are independent random variables, this yields

$$\mathbb{P}\big[\forall i : \ |A_i^* - A_i| \leq \varepsilon\big] \geq \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{c\varepsilon^2}\right)^N. \tag{S39}$$

Finally,

$$\left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{c\varepsilon^2}\right)^N \geq \overline{\alpha} \tag{S40}$$

is satisfied if

$$c \geq c_{\text{opt}} \coloneqq \left\lceil \frac{\sigma^2/\varepsilon^2}{1 - \overline{\alpha}^{1/N}} \right\rceil. \tag{S41}$$

To finish the proof we upper bound

$$c_{\text{opt}} = \left\lceil \frac{\sigma^2/\varepsilon^2}{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\ln(1/\overline{\alpha})}{N}}} \right\rceil. \tag{S42}$$

Using that (see Section S6 B) for all $x \geq 0$

$$\frac{1}{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-1/x}} \leq x + \frac{1}{2 + 2x} + \frac{1}{2}, \tag{S43}$$

it follows that

$$c_{\text{opt}} \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2}\left(\frac{N}{\ln(1/\overline{\alpha})} + \frac{1}{2 + \frac{2N}{\ln(1/\overline{\alpha})}} + \frac{1}{2}\right). \tag{S44}$$

To simplify the right-hand side of this inequality, we use that, since $\overline{\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{2} \geq \mathrm{e}^{-1}$, it holds that $\ln(1/\overline{\alpha}) \leq 1$ and, therefore, $2 + \frac{2N}{\ln(1/\overline{\alpha})} \geq 4$. So, using again that $\ln(1/\overline{\alpha}) \leq 1$, we finally arrive at

$$c_{\text{opt}} \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2}\left(\frac{N}{\ln(1/\overline{\alpha})} + \frac{3}{4}\right) \leq \frac{\sigma^2(N+1)}{\varepsilon^2 \ln(1/\overline{\alpha})}. \tag{S45}$$

□

### S3.C Proof of Theorem 2

Before the proof of Theorem 2, we present three auxiliary lemmas specific to the fidelity bound $F^{(0)}$ for the Gaussian case. The first lemma upper-bounds the number of elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ which the fidelity bound $F^{(0)}$ depends on.

**Lemma S5** (Sparsity of the Gaussian fidelity bound)**.** $F^{(0)}$ *depends on at most* $2m\kappa$ *elements of* $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$*. We call these the* relevant elements *of* $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$.

*Proof.* Equation (S6) can be written as

$$F^{(0)} = 1 + \frac{m}{2} + \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T(2\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{x}) - \mathrm{Tr}\big[\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\big]. \tag{S46}$$

The last term can, in turn, be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}\big[\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}\big] &= \sum_{k=1}^{2m} D_{k,k}^{-2}(\mathbf{o}^{(k)})^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}\mathbf{o}^{(k)} \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{m}\Big\{s_j^{-2}\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)}(\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)})^T + s_j^2\mathbf{o}^{(2j)}(\mathbf{o}^{(2j)})^T\Big\}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{S47}$$

Due to the sparsity of $\mathbf{O}$, as described in Section S1, each matrix $s_j^{-2}\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)}(\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)})^T + s_j^2\mathbf{o}^{(2j)}(\mathbf{o}^{(2j)})^T$ has at most $4d^2$ non-zero elements. Hence, summing over $j$, we see that $F^{(0)}$ depends on at most $4m\min\{d^2, m\} = 2\kappa m$ elements of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$. □

Note that the counting argument following equation (S47) does not take into account the fact that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ is symmetric. Taking this fact into account, we see that, from the $4d^2$ relevant elements of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ that appear in each term of the trace (S47), only $d(2d+1)$ are independent. Thus, even though $2m\kappa$ entries of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ contribute to $F^{(0)}$, only $m\min\{d(2d+1), 4m\} \leq 2m\kappa$ of them must actually be measured.

The second auxiliary lemma bounds the deviation of $F^{(0)*}$ from $F^{(0)}$ in terms of the errors made in the estimation of the individual expectation values entering $F^{(0)}$.

**Lemma S6** (Stability of the Gaussian fidelity bound)**.** *Let $F^{(0)*}$ be defined like $F^{(0)}$ in equation (S6) but with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)*}$ and let $\epsilon_{\max} \coloneqq \|\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^*\|_{\max}$ and $\varepsilon^{(1)}_{\max} \coloneqq \|\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)*}\|_{\max}$. Then*

$$|F^{(0)} - F^{(0)*}| \leq 2s_{\max}^2\left(\varepsilon^{(1)}_{\max}\sqrt{\kappa}m + \epsilon_{\max}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2\sqrt{2m}\right). \tag{S48}$$

*Proof.* For convenience, we define the *error vector*

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \coloneqq \boldsymbol{\gamma} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{2m} \tag{S49}$$

and the *error matrix*

$$\mathcal{E}^{(1)} \coloneqq \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)*}. \tag{S50}$$

The fidelity estimation error can then be written as

$$F^{(0)} - F^{(0)*} = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T(\mathcal{E}^{(1)} + 2\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\mathbf{x}^T)\right]. \tag{S51}$$

Due to Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}|F^{(0)} - F^{(0)*}| &\leq \|\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}^{-2}\mathbf{O}^T\|_\infty\|\mathcal{E}^{(1)} + 2\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\mathbf{x}^T\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{D}^{-2}\|_\infty\left(\|\mathcal{E}^{(1)}\|_1 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_2\|\mathbf{x}\|_2\right),\end{aligned} \tag{S52}$$

where in the last step we have used the bound (S34). The second inequality in equation (S32) implies that $\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2m}\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_\infty$. It remains to bound $\|\mathcal{E}\|_1$. To this end, we use the first inequality in equation (S32) and equation (S30) to arrive at

$$\|\mathcal{E}^{(1)}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{2m}\|\,\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{E}^{(1)})\|_2. \tag{S53}$$

According to Lemma S5, $F^{(0)}$ depends on at most $2\kappa m$ entries of $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}$. Without loss of generality we can hence omit all other elements of $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}$ and thus take $\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{E}^{(1)})$ as a vector with at most $2\kappa m$ elements. Using this fact and the second inequality in equation (S32) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{E}^{(1)}\|_1 &\leq \sqrt{2m}\sqrt{2m\kappa}\|\,\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{E}^{(1)})\|_\infty \\ &= 2m\sqrt{\kappa}\|\mathcal{E}^{(1)}\|_{\max},\end{aligned} \tag{S54}$$

where we have used equation (S31) in the last equality. Finally, putting everything together and using that, by definition, $\|\mathbf{D}^{-2}\|_\infty = s_{\max}^2$, we arrive at the inequality (S48). □

The third auxiliary lemma shows that the estimate of the fidelity lower-bound for target states $\varrho_{\rm t} \in \mathcal{C}_{\rm G}$ obtained with the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\rm G}$ in Box S1 is reliable. This lemma is potentially interesting in its own right in scenarios other than certification.

**Lemma S7** (Reliable estimation of the Gaussian fidelity bound)**.** *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $F^{(0)*}$ be defined like $F^{(0)}$ in equation (S6) but with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)*}$, where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)*}$ are obtained as described by $\mathcal{M}_{\rm G}$ from*

$$C = 2mC_1 + 2\kappa m C_2 \tag{S55}$$

*copies of $\varrho_{\rm p}$ , with $C_1$ and $C_2$ integers such that*

$$C_1 \geq 2^6 \frac{\sigma_1^2 (2m+1)\, m\, s_{\max}^4\, \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{\varepsilon^2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)} \tag{S56a}$$

*and*

$$C_2 \geq 2^5 \frac{\sigma_2^2 (2\kappa m+1)\, m^2\, s_{\max}^4\, \kappa}{\varepsilon^2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)}. \tag{S56b}$$

*Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|F^{(0)} - F^{(0)*}| \leq \varepsilon\right] \geq 1 - \alpha. \tag{S57}$$

*Proof.* Our proof strategy is to show that, with probability at least $1-\alpha$, the $2m$ elements of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and the $2m\kappa$ relevant elements of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ are estimated within additive errors bounded as

$$\epsilon_{\max} \leq \epsilon_{\max}^* := \frac{\varepsilon}{4 s_{\max}^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \sqrt{2m}} \tag{S58a}$$

and

$$\varepsilon_{\max}^{(1)} \leq \varepsilon_{\max}^{*(1)} := \frac{\varepsilon}{4 s_{\max}^2 \sqrt{\kappa m}}. \tag{S58b}$$

If the inequalities (S58) are fulfiled, then, due to Lemma S6, it holds that $|F^{(0)} - F^{(0)*}| \leq \varepsilon$.

Since all $2m$ estimates $\{\gamma_l^*\}_l$ are sample averages over independent copies of $\varrho_{\rm p}$, the measurement outcomes to obtain the $\{\gamma_l^*\}_l$ are all independent random variables, for each $l$ described by the same probability distribution. Furthermore, by assumption, the variances of these variables are all upper-bounded by $\sigma_1$. Analogously, the measurement outcomes to obtain all $2m\kappa$ relevant estimates $\{\Gamma_{l,l'}^{(1)*}\}_{l,l'}$ are independent random variables with variances upper-bounded by $\sigma_2$ and described, for each $l$ and $l'$, by the same probability distribution. Hence, according to Lemma S4, with the choice $\overline{\alpha} = \sqrt{1-\alpha}$, taking

$$C_1 \geq 2 \frac{\sigma_1^2 (2m+1)}{{\epsilon_{\max}^*}^2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)} \tag{S59a}$$

and

$$C_2 \geq 2 \frac{\sigma_2^2 (2\kappa m+1)}{{\varepsilon_{\max}^{*(1)}}^2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)}, \tag{S59b}$$

is sufficient for both

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\forall l:\ |\gamma_l^* - \gamma_l| \leq \epsilon_{\max}^*\right] \geq \sqrt{1-\alpha} \tag{S60a}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\forall\, \Gamma^{(1)}_{l,l'} \text{ relevant}: \ |\Gamma^{(1)*}_{l,l'} - \Gamma^{(1)}_{l,l'}| \leq \varepsilon^{*(1)}_{\max}\right] \geq \sqrt{1-\alpha}. \tag{S60b}$$

Since the $\{\gamma^*_l\}_l$ and the $\{\Gamma^{(1)*}_{l,l'}\}_{l,l'}$ are independent random variables, equations (S60) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\begin{array}{rcl} \forall l: \ |\gamma^*_l - \gamma_l| & \leq & \epsilon^*_{\max} \\ \text{and } \forall\, \Gamma^{(1)}_{l,l'} \text{ relevant}: \ |\Gamma^{(1)*}_{l,l'} - \Gamma^{(1)}_{l,l'}| & \leq & \varepsilon^{*(1)}_{\max} \end{array}\right] \geq 1-\alpha. \tag{S61}$$

Finally, inserting the definitions (S58) of $\epsilon^*_{\max}$ and $\varepsilon^{*(1)}_{\max}$ into equations (S59), we see that equations (S56) are equivalent to equations (S59). □

Now, we prove the theorem on quantum certification of Gaussian states.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* That the total number of copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ (see equation (S55)) needed for the certification test is asymptotically upper-bounded by equation (10) can be verified by straightforward calculation using equations (S56). It remains to show that $(i)$ if $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}} = \varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$, then $\mathcal{T}$ accepts with probability at least $1-\alpha$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[F^{(0)*} \geq F_T + \varepsilon\right] \geq 1-\alpha, \tag{S62}$$

and $(ii)$ if $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ is such that $F < F_T$, then $\mathcal{T}$ rejects with probability at least $1-\alpha$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[F^{(0)*} < F_{\mathrm{T}} + \varepsilon\right] \geq 1-\alpha. \tag{S63}$$

To show $(i)$, we first recall that, if $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}} = \varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$, $F^{(0)} = 1$. With this, equation (S57) in Lemma S7 implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[F^{(0)*} \geq 1-\varepsilon\right] \geq 1-\alpha. \tag{S64}$$

Since, by assumption of the theorem, the total estimation error is such that $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1-F_{\mathrm{T}}}{2}$, it holds that $1-\varepsilon \geq F_T + \varepsilon$. Substituting the latter inequality into equation (S64) yields equation (S62).

To show $(ii)$, we first note that, since $F^{(0)} \leq F$ for all $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$, if $F < F_T$, then

$$F^{(0)} < F_{\mathrm{T}}. \tag{S65}$$

On the other hand, equation (S57) implies also that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[F^{(0)*} \leq F^{(0)} + \varepsilon\right] \geq 1-\alpha. \tag{S66}$$

Inserting equation (S65) into equation (S66) yields equation (S63). □

### S3.D Proof of Theorem 3

We proceed analogously to the last section and present three auxiliary lemmas specific to the fidelity bound $F^{(n)}$ for the linear-optical case before proving Theorem 3.

To state the first lemma in a compact form we introduce the shorthand $\mathbf{\Gamma} := \left(\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(i)}\right)_{i=1,\ldots,n+1}$ for the collection of all the moment tensors $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(i)}$. Analogously, the collection of all the estimates $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(i)*}$ of the moment tensors, defined in Box S2, is denoted by $\mathbf{\Gamma}^* := \left(\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(i)*}\right)_{i=1,\ldots,n+1}$.

**Lemma S8** (Sparsity of the linear-optical fidelity bound)**.** *The fidelity bound $F^{(n)}$ defined in equation (S15) can be written as*

$$F^{(n)} = 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1/2)^{n-j} f_j\left(\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)}, \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j+1)}\right), \tag{S67}$$

*where, for each $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $f_j$ is a linear functional given by*

$$f_j\left(\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)}, \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j+1)}\right) := \sum_{\mu=1}^{\binom{n}{j}} \left\{ \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\mathbb{1} \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in \Omega_\mu^{(j)}} \mathbf{P}^{(i)}\right)\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j+1)}\right] + \frac{m+2n}{2} \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\bigotimes_{i \in \Omega_\mu^{(j)}} \mathbf{P}^{(i)}\right)\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)}\right] \right\}. \tag{S68}$$

*For each $j$, the functional $f_j$ depends on at most $\binom{n}{j}(2d)^{2j}$ elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)}$ and on at most $\binom{n}{j}2m(2d)^{2j}$ elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j+1)}$. We call these the* relevant elements for $f_j$. *Moreover, $F^{(n)}$ depends on at most*

$$N_{\leq 2(n+1)} := (1+2m)(4d^2+1)^n \in \mathrm{O}\left(m\left(4d^2+1\right)^n\right) \tag{S69}$$

*elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. We call these the* relevant elements *of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$.*

The subindex "$\leq 2(n+1)$" in $N_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ makes reference to the fact that $2j$-th moments with $j \in [n+1]$ are taken into account.

*Proof.* Equations (S67) and (S68) can be checked by a straightforward calculation. We use again the sparsity of $\mathbf{O}$, i.e., the property that its columns $\mathbf{o}^{(2j-1)}$ and $\mathbf{o}^{(2j)}$ have at least $2(m-d)$ zero element in common. Hence, each of the symmetric matrices $\mathbf{P}^{(j)}$, defined in equation (S9), has at most $(2d)^2$ non-zero elements. Consequently, the projectors $\bigotimes_{i\in\Omega_\mu^{(j)}} \mathbf{P}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbb{1} \otimes \bigotimes_{i\in\Omega_\mu^{(j)}} \mathbf{P}^{(i)}$ in equation (S68) have at most $(2d)^{2j}$ and $2m(2d)^{2j}$ non-zero elements. This implies that the first trace inside the sum in equation (S68) depends on at most $2m(2d)^{2j}$ elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j+1)}$ and the second trace inside the sum on at most $(2d)^{2j}$ elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)}$. Hence, each $f_j$ depends on at most $\binom{n}{j}(2d)^{2j}$ elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)}$ and on at most $\binom{n}{j}2m(2d)^{2j}$ elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j+1)}$. This proves the statements on the sparsity of the functionals $f_i$. From this, it follows that $F^{(n)}$ depends on at most

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n}\left(\binom{n}{i}(2d)^{2i} + \binom{n}{i}2m(2d)^{2i}\right) = (1+2m)(4d^2+1)^n \tag{S70}$$

elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ in total, where in the last step we have used the binomial theorem. □

It is important to mention that, as in Lemma S5 for the Gaussian case, the symmetry (S14) of each $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(j)}$ was not taken into account. Thus, even though the lemma gives the maximal total number of relevant elements that contribute to $F^{(n)}$, many of them are not independent and must therefore not be measured.

The second auxiliary lemma upper-bounds the deviation of $F^{(n)*}$ from $F^{(n)}$ in terms of the errors made in the estimation of the expectation values entering $F^{(n)}$.

**Lemma S9** (Stability of the linear-optical fidelity bound)**.** *Let $F^{(n)*}$ be defined like $F^{(n)}$ in equation* (S15) *but with $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ replaced by $\mathbf{\Gamma}^*$ and let $\varepsilon_{\max} := \|\mathbf{\Gamma} - \mathbf{\Gamma}^*\|_{\max}$. Then*

$$|F^{(n)} - F^{(n)*}| \leq \varepsilon_{\max}\,(n+5m/2)\left(1/2 + 2d\sqrt{2nm}\right)^n. \tag{S71}$$

*Proof.* For convenience, we define, for each $j \in [n]$, the *error tensor*

$$\mathcal{E}^{(j)} := \Gamma^{(j)} - \Gamma^{(j)*} \in \left(\mathbb{R}^{2m\times 2m}\right)^{\otimes j}. \tag{S72}$$

Using equation (S67) and the fact that $f_j$ is linear, we write the fidelity estimation error as

$$F^{(n)} - F^{(n)*} = \sum_{j=0}^{n}(-1/2)^{n-j} f_j\left(\mathcal{E}^{(j)}, \mathcal{E}^{(j+1)}\right), \tag{S73}$$

Applying Hölder's inequality and using that the Schatten $\infty$-norm of a tensor product of projectors is bounded by 1 yields

$$|f_j\left(\mathcal{E}^{(j)}, \mathcal{E}^{(j+1)}\right)| \leq \binom{n}{j}\left(\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j+1)}\right\|_1 + \frac{m+2n}{2}\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j)}\right\|_1\right),$$

where the matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j)}$ is defined element-wise by $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j)}_{\mathbf{k}^{(j)},\mathbf{l}^{(j)}} := \mathcal{E}^{(j)}_{k_1,l_1,\dots,k_j,l_j}$, where $\mathbf{k}^{(j)} := (k_1,\dots,k_j)$ and $\mathbf{l}^{(j)} := (l_1,\dots,l_j)$.

Thanks to the first bound in equation (S32) and equation (S30), we arrive at

$$|f_j\left(\mathcal{E}^{(j)},\mathcal{E}^{(j+1)}\right)| \leq \binom{n}{j}(2m)^{j/2}\left(\sqrt{2m}\left\|\mathrm{vec}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j+1)})\right\|_2 + \frac{m+2n}{2}\left\|\mathrm{vec}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j)})\right\|_2\right). \tag{S74}$$

According to Lemma S8, $f_j$ depends on at most $\binom{n}{j}2m(2d)^{2j}$ elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j+1)}$ and on at most $\binom{n}{j}(2d)^{2j}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j)}$. Without loss of generality we can hence omit, in equation (S74), all other elements in $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j)}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j+1)}$ and thus take $\mathrm{vec}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j)})$ and $\mathrm{vec}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j+1)})$ as vectors with at most $\binom{n}{j}(2d)^{2j}$ and $\binom{n}{j}2m(2d)^{2j}$ elements, respectively. Then the second bound in equation (S32) yields

$$|f_j\left(\mathcal{E}^{(j)},\mathcal{E}^{(j+1)}\right)| \leq \binom{n}{j}^{3/2}(2m)^{j/2}(2d)^j\left[2m\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j+1)}\right\|_{\max} + \frac{m+2n}{2}\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(j)}\right\|_{\max}\right]. \tag{S75}$$

Next, from equation (S73), it follows that

$$|F^{(n)} - F^{(n)*}| \leq \varepsilon_{\max}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{n}\binom{n}{j}^{3/2}(1/2)^{n-j}\left(\sqrt{2m}2d\right)^j \times (5m/2+n)\right]. \tag{S76}$$

Finally, using $\binom{n}{j}^{1/2} \leq n^{j/2}$ and the binomial formula, we obtain the inequality (S71). □

The third auxiliary lemma shows that the estimate of the fidelity lower-bound for target states $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ obtained with the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ in Box S2 is reliable. This lemma is potentially interesting in its own right in scenarios other than certification.

**Lemma S10** (Reliable estimation of the linear-optical fidelity bound)**.** *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $F^{(n)*}$ be defined like $F^{(n)}$ in equation (S15) but with $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ replaced by $\mathbf{\Gamma}^*$, where $\mathbf{\Gamma}^*$ is obtained as described by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ from*

$$C = N_{\leq 2(n+1)}C_{\leq 2(n+1)} \tag{S77}$$

*copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$, with $N_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ an integer given by equation (S69) and $C_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ an integer given by*

$$C_{\leq 2(n+1)} \geq \frac{\sigma^2_{\leq 2(n+1)}(N_{\leq 2(n+1)}+1)}{\varepsilon^2\ln(1/(1-\alpha))}(n+5m/2)^2\left(1/2+2d\sqrt{2nm}\right)^{2n}. \tag{S78}$$

*Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|F^{(n)} - F^{(n)*}| \leq \varepsilon\right] \geq 1-\alpha. \tag{S79}$$

*Proof.* Our proof strategy is similar to that of Lemma S7. That is, we show that, with probability at least $1-\alpha$, the $N_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ relevant elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ are estimated within additive errors bounded as

$$\varepsilon_{\max} \leq \varepsilon^*_{\max} \coloneqq \frac{\varepsilon}{(n+5m/2)\left(1/2+2d\sqrt{2nm}\right)^n}. \tag{S80}$$

If this inequality is fulfiled, then, due to Lemma S9, it holds that $|F^{(n)} - F^{(n)*}| \leq \varepsilon$.

According to Lemma S4, with the choice $\overline{\alpha} = 1-\alpha$, taking

$$C_{\leq 2(n+1)} \geq \frac{\sigma^2_{\leq 2(n+1)}(N_{\leq 2(n+1)}+1)}{{\varepsilon^*_{\max}}^2\ln(1/(1-\alpha))}. \tag{S81}$$

is sufficient to get

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\forall\,\Gamma^{(i)}_{k_1,l_1,\ldots,k_i,l_i}\text{ relevant} : |\Gamma^{(i)*}_{k_1,l_1,\ldots,k_i,l_i} - \Gamma^{(i)}_{k_1,l_1,\ldots,k_i,l_i}| \leq \varepsilon^*_{\max}\right] \geq 1-\alpha \tag{S82}$$

Finally, inserting the definition (S80) of $\varepsilon^*_{\max}$ into equation (S81), we see that equation (S79) is equivalent to equation (S81). □

Now, we prove the theorem on quantum certification of linear-optical network states.

*Proof of Theorem 3.* The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 2, but with equation (S77), equation (11), $F^{(n)}$, $F^{(n)*}$, Lemma S10, and equation (S79) playing respectively the roles of equation (S55), equation (10) , $F^{(0)}$, $F^{(0)*}$, Lemma S7 and equation (S57). □

### S3.E Proof of Corollary S1

The proof relies on three auxiliary lemmas equivalent to Lemmas S5, S6, and S7.

**Lemma S11** (Sparsity of the locally post-selected Gaussian fidelity bound)**.** *$F_{\mathcal{S}}{}^{(0)}$ depends on at most $2m\kappa$ elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(1)}$. We call these the* relevant elements *of $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(1)}$.*

*Proof.* The proof of the lemma is analogous to that of Lemma S5. □

**Lemma S12** (Stability of the locally post-selected Gaussian fidelity bound)**.** *Let $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(0)*}$ be defined by the same expression to $F^{(0)}$ in equation (S6) but divided by $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})$ and with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^*$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(1)*}$, and let $\epsilon_{\max} \coloneqq \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^*\|_{\max}$ and $\varepsilon_{\max}^{(1)} \coloneqq \|\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(1)} - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(1)*}\|_{\max}$. Then*

$$|F_{\mathcal{S}}{}^{(0)} - F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(0)*}| \leq \frac{2s_{\max}^2}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})} \left(\varepsilon_{\max}^{(1)}\sqrt{\kappa}m + \epsilon_{\max}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2\sqrt{2m}\right). \tag{S83}$$

*Proof.* The proof of the lemma is similar to that of Lemma S6, with the differences already explained in Section S2 C. □

**Lemma S13** (Reliable estimation of the locally post-selected Gaussian fidelity bound)**.** *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(0)*}$ be defined by the same expression to $F_{\mathcal{S}}{}^{(0)}$ in equation (S6) but divided by $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})$ and with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^*$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(1)*}$, where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^*$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(1)*}$ are obtained as described in Section S2 C from*

$$C = 2mC_1 + 2\kappa mC_2 \tag{S84}$$

*copies of $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}$, with $C_1$ and $C_2$ integers such that*

$$C_1 \geq 2^6 \frac{\varsigma_1^2(2m+1)\, m\, s_{\max}^4\, \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{\left[\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})\varepsilon\right]^2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)} \tag{S85a}$$

*and*

$$C_2 \geq 2^5 \frac{\varsigma_2^2(2\kappa m+1)\, m^2\, s_{\max}^4\, \kappa}{\left[\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})\varepsilon\right]^2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)}. \tag{S85b}$$

*Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|F_{\mathcal{S}}{}^{(0)} - F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(0)*}| \leq \varepsilon\right] \geq 1 - \alpha. \tag{S86}$$

*Proof.* The proof of the lemma is analogous to that of Lemma S7. □

*Proof of Corollary S1.* The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 2 but with Lemmas S11, S12, and S13 playing respectively the roles of Lemmas S5, S6, and S7. □

### S3.F Proof of Corollary S2

As in the previous subsection, the proof relies on three auxiliaryary lemmas equivalent to Lemmas S8, S9, and S10. The proofs of the lemmas are analogous to, and follow immediately from, those of the latter.

**Lemma S14** (Sparsity of the locally post-selected linear-optical fidelity bound)**.** *The fidelity bound ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$, defined by the same expression as $F^{(n)}$ in equation (S15) but divided by $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})$ and with $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}$, can be written as*

$$ {F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}\left[1-\sum_{j=0}^{n}(-1/2)^{n-j} f_j\left(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(j)},\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}^{(j+1)}\right)\right], \tag{S87} $$

*where, for each $j\in\{0,\dots,n\}$, $f_j$ is the same linear functional as in Lemma S8, defined by equation (S68). Moreover, ${F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)}$ depends on at most $N_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ elements of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}$, with $N_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ the same as in Lemma S8 and given by equation (S69).*

*Proof.* The proof of the lemma is analogous to that of Lemma S8. □

**Lemma S15** (Stability of the locally post-selected linear-optical fidelity bound)**.** *Let $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*}$ be defined by the same expression as $F^{(n)}$ in equation (S15) but divided by $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})$ and with $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*_{\mathcal{S}}$, and let $\varepsilon_{\max}\coloneqq\|\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}-\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{\max}$. Then*

$$ |{F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)} - F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{\max}}{\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})}(n+5m/2)\left(1/2+2d\sqrt{2nm}\right)^n. \tag{S88} $$

*Proof.* The proof of the lemma is similar to that of Lemma S9, with the differences already explained in Section S2 C. □

**Lemma S16** (Reliable estimation of the locally post-selected linear-optical fidelity bound)**.** *Let $\alpha\in(0,1/2]$ and $\varepsilon>0$. Let $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*}$ be defined like $F^{(n)}$ in equation (S15) but with $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*_{\mathcal{S}}$, where $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^*_{\mathcal{S}}$ is obtained as described in Section S2 C from*

$$ C = N_{\leq 2(n+1)} C_{\leq 2(n+1)} \tag{S89} $$

*copies of $\varrho_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}$, with $N_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ an integer given by equation (S69) and $C_{\leq 2(n+1)}$ an integer given by*

$$ C_{\leq 2(n+1)} \geq \frac{\varsigma^2_{\leq 2(n+1)}(N_{\leq 2(n+1)}+1)}{\left[\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{A}}|\varrho_{\mathrm{t}})\,\varepsilon\right]^2\ln(1/(1-\alpha))}(n+5m/2)^2\left(1/2+2d\sqrt{2nm}\right)^{2n}. \tag{S90} $$

*Then,*

$$ \mathbb{P}\left[|{F_{\mathcal{S}}}^{(n)} - F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*}|\leq\varepsilon\right]\geq 1-\alpha. \tag{S91} $$

*Proof.* The proof of the lemma is analogous to that of Lemma S10. □

*Proof of Corollary S2.* The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 3 but with Lemmas S14, S15, and S16 playing respectively the roles of Lemmas S8, S9, and S10. □

### S3.G Proof of Theorem 5

Crucial for the proof of this theorem is the expansion (12) of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ in terms of $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}$ and $\varrho_{\mathrm{t}}^{\perp}$, which leads to the definition (13) of the photon mismatch $\tilde{n}^{\perp}$. Also, before the proof, we note that the fidelity gap cannot be smaller than $\Delta\geq 2\varepsilon$: The condition for acceptance of the test is $F^{(n)*}\geq F_{\mathrm{T}}+\Delta-\varepsilon$, whereas that for rejection is $F^{(n)*}<F_{\mathrm{T}}+\varepsilon$. So, the threshold of acceptance, $F=F_{\mathrm{T}}+\Delta-\varepsilon$, is not smaller than that of rejection, $F=F_{\mathrm{T}}+\varepsilon$, iff $\Delta\geq 2\varepsilon$.

*Proof of Theorem 5.* Theorems 2 and 3 imply that $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ is rejected with probability at least $1-\alpha$ whenever $F<F_{\mathrm{T}}$. Thus, it remains to show that if $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ is such that $F\geq F_{\mathrm{T}}+\Delta$, with $\Delta$ given by equation (14), then $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ is accepted with probability at least $1-\alpha$, i.e., that

$$ \mathbb{P}\left[F^{(n)*}\geq F_{\mathrm{T}}+\varepsilon\right]\geq 1-\alpha. \tag{S92} $$

So, let $F\geq F_{\mathrm{T}}+\Delta$, with $\Delta$ given by (14). Using equations (8), (12), and (13), we write $F^{(n)}$ as

$$ F^{(n)} = 1-(1-F)\tilde{n}^{\perp}\geq 1-(1-(F_{\mathrm{T}}+\Delta))\tilde{n}^{\perp}. \tag{S93} $$

Using that

$$\Delta \geq \frac{2\varepsilon + (1 - F_{\mathrm{T}})(\tilde{n}^{\perp} - 1)}{\tilde{n}^{\perp}} \tag{S94}$$

and inserting it into the inequality (S93), we obtain

$$F^{(n)} \geq F_{\mathrm{T}} + 2\varepsilon. \tag{S95}$$

Finally, using equations (S95) and (S79), we obtain equation (S92). □

## S4 Number of measurement settings

In this section, we upper-bound the number of local measurement settings required for the estimation of our fidelity lower bounds. We do this explicitly only for the Gaussian and linear-optical network target states, the cases of the post-selected target states following immediately from them.

### S4.A Gaussian case

Here, we show that the $2md$ single-quadrature and the $m\kappa$ two-quadrature observables listed in Box S1, required for the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$, can all be measured using $m + 3$ different experimental arrangements. We do this by explicitly describing a measurement strategy that features such a scaling.

The two-body observables $\hat{q}_j\hat{q}_k$, $\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_k$, and $\hat{p}_j\hat{p}_k$, for $j \neq k$, can be measured by simultaneously homodyning modes $j$ and $k$. For all possible pairs of modes, this consumes $m + 2$ different homodyne settings: A single setting $(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2, \ldots, \hat{q}_m)$ for all the second moments of the form $\langle \hat{q}_j\hat{q}_k \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$; another single setting $(\hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2, \ldots, \hat{p}_m)$ for those of the form $\langle \hat{p}_j\hat{p}_k \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$; and the $m$ settings $(\hat{p}_1, \hat{q}_2, \ldots, \hat{q}_m)$, $(\hat{q}_1, \hat{p}_2, \hat{q}_3, \ldots, \hat{q}_m)$, …, and $(\hat{q}_1, \ldots, \hat{q}_{m-1}, \hat{p}_m)$ for those of the form $\langle \hat{q}_j\hat{p}_k \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$ and $\langle \hat{p}_j\hat{q}_k \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$ with $j \neq k$. In addition, all the single-body observables $\hat{q}_j$, $\hat{p}_j$, $\hat{q}_j^2$, and $\hat{p}_j^2$, are measured also with these same settings. With this, we have accounted, so far, for all the first moments $\gamma_l$ and all the second moments $\Gamma^{(1)}_{l,l'}$ with $(l, l') \neq (2j - 1, 2j)$ for all $j \in [m]$.

The remaining second moments, $\Gamma^{(1)}_{2j-1,2j}$ with $j \in [m]$, correspond to the single-mode observables $(\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j + \hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j)/2$. To measure these, Arthur can homodyne each mode $j$ independently in the rotated quadrature $(\hat{q}_j + \hat{p}_j)/\sqrt{2}$. This requires a single setting: $\left[(\hat{q}_1 + \hat{p}_1)/\sqrt{2}, (\hat{q}_2 + \hat{p}_2)/\sqrt{2}, \ldots, (\hat{q}_1 + \hat{p}_1)/\sqrt{2}\right]$. In this setting, he can estimate all the moments of the form $\langle (\hat{q}_j + \hat{p}_j)^2/2 \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$. The latter estimates, upon subtraction of $\langle \hat{q}_j^2 \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}/2$ and $\langle \hat{p}_j^2 \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}/2$, whose settings have already been accounted for, finally make it possible to calculate an estimate of $\langle (\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j + \hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j)/2 \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$, using the equation

$$\frac{1}{2}(\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j + \hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j) = \left(\frac{\hat{q}_j + \hat{p}_j}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2 - \frac{\hat{q}_j^2}{2} - \frac{\hat{p}_j^2}{2}. \tag{S96}$$

The last setting, plus the $m + 2$ ones already accounted for in the previous paragraph, yields a total of $m + 3$ different homodyne settings, as promised.

Finally, a comment on the error estimation is in order. In any measurement strategy where moments are estimated indirectly, their errors must be obtained from those of the directly measured quantities via error propagation. For instance, in the strategy just described, the error of each $\Gamma^{(1)}_{2j-1,2j}$ needs to be calculated from those of $\langle (\hat{q}_j + \hat{p}_j)^2/2 \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$, $\langle \hat{q}_j^2 \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$, and $\langle \hat{p}_j^2 \rangle_{\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}}$. This leads, for each indirectly estimated moment, to an increase in the number of copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$ required to attain a given error. Nevertheless, this usually has no impact on the leading terms of the total resource scaling of the protocol. For example, in the described strategy the global scaling given in equation (10) remains unaltered.

### S4.B Linear-optical case

Here, we show that the $N_{\leq 2(n+1)} \in \mathrm{O}\left(m\left(4d^2 + 1\right)^n\right)$ observables listed in Box S2, required for the measurement scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$, can all be measured using at most $\binom{m}{n}2^{n+1}$ different experimental arrangements. As in the previous section, we do this by explicitly describing a measurement strategy that features the promised scaling.

The scheme $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$ requires the measurement of products of an even number between 2 and $2(n + 1)$ quadrature operators. We describe the measurement strategy as follows. First, we upper-bound the number of homodyne settings required for the measurement of all possible products of $2n$ quadrature operators, necessary for estimating all $n$-th moments $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n)}$. The measurement of products of fewer quadrature operators can clearly be carried out with the same settings. Then, we show that the particular

products of $2(n+1)$ quadrature operators that appear in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}$, corresponding to the relevant elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n+1)}$, do not require extra settings either.

Consider all products of $2n$ quadrature operators. Among these, we focus first on those containing exclusively either $\hat{q}_j$ or $\hat{p}_j$ (or powers thereof) for each $j$-th mode but exclude observables such as $(\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j+\hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j)/2$, which we address in the next paragraph. Let us divide this family into two subfamilies: $(i)$ those for which the number of operators $\hat{q}_j$ is smaller or equal than that of the operators $\hat{p}_j$ and $(ii)$ those for which the number of operators $\hat{q}_j$ is greater than that of the operators $\hat{p}_j$. All correlators in the subfamily $(i)$ can be measured with homodyne settings where $n$ modes are detected in the position quadrature $\hat{q}_j$ and the remaining $m-n$ ones in the momentum quadrature $\hat{p}_j$. All those in the subfamily $(ii)$ can be measured with homodyne settings where $n$ modes are detected in momentum and the remaining $m-n$ ones in position. Taking the two subfamilies into account, there are at most $2\binom{m}{n}$ different such settings.

Let us now focus on the products of $2n$ quadrature operators that include different quadrature operators on a same mode, such as $(\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j+\hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j)/2$ (or powers thereof). At most, $n$ factors as $(\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j+\hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j)/2$ can appear in each product of $2n$ quadrature operators. From equation (S96), we know that by replacing in each of the settings for the subfamily $(i)$ above a quadrature $\hat{q}_j$ with the rotated quadrature $(\hat{q}_j+\hat{p}_j)/\sqrt{2}$, Arthur can indirectly estimate the expectation values of all the $2n$-quadrature products of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}(\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j+\hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j)\\ &\times \text{ up to } n-1 \text{ position operators}\\ &\times \text{ at least } n \text{ momentum operators.}\end{aligned} \tag{S97}$$

In turn, by replacing, in each of the resulting settings, a further quadrature $\hat{q}_{j'}$ with $(\hat{q}_{j'}+\hat{p}_{j'})/\sqrt{2}$, he can measure all the observables of the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}(\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j+\hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j)\times\frac{1}{2}(\hat{q}_{j'}\hat{p}_{j'}+\hat{p}_{j'}\hat{q}_{j'})\\ &\times \text{ up to } n-2 \text{ position operators}\\ &\times \text{ at least } n \text{ momentum operators.}\end{aligned} \tag{S98}$$

Concatenating this procedure, he can measure all the $2n$-quadrature products where each mode contributes with either $\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j+\hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j$, $\hat{q}_j$, or $\hat{p}_j$, and the number of operators $\hat{q}_j$ is smaller or equal than that of the operators $\hat{p}_j$. Equivalently, by proceeding analogously with the subfamily $(ii)$ and the quadratures $\hat{p}_j$, he can measure all $2n$-quadrature products where each mode contributes with either $\hat{q}_j\hat{p}_j+\hat{p}_j\hat{q}_j$, $\hat{q}_j$, or $\hat{p}_j$, and the number of operators $\hat{q}_j$ is greater than that of the operators $\hat{p}_j$. This is enough to indirectly estimate the expectation values of all $2n$-quadrature products. For each setting of the two subfamilies, $n$ modes can be rotated, giving rise to $2^n$ setting ramifications. Hence, taking into account all the settings of the two subfamilies and their ramifications, we count a total of at most $2\binom{m}{n}2^n=\binom{m}{n}2^{n+1}$ different settings. This counting clearly over-counts the necessary settings but is enough for our purposes.

Finally, we consider the products of $2(n+1)$ quadrature operators appearing in the relevant elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n+1)}$. The $(n+1)$-th moment tensor $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n+1)}$ is special in that, in contrast to the lower-moment tensors, it appears in just the first of the two traces in equations (S15) and (S68). In particular, according to Box S2, $\Gamma^{(n+1)}_{k_1,l_1,\ldots,k_n,l_n,k_{n+1},l_{n+1}}$ is a relevant element of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n+1)}$ if, and only if, $k_{n+1}=l_{n+1}$. This implies that the observables containing the factor $(\hat{q}_{n+1}\hat{p}_{n+1}+\hat{p}_{n+1}\hat{q}_{n+1})$ do not contribute to the relevant elements of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n+1)}$, only those containing either $\hat{q}^2_{n+1}$ or $\hat{p}^2_{n+1}$ are relevant. Hence, the relevant $2(n+1)$ quadrature products are those composed of the $2n$ quadrature products relevant for $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n)}$ times either $\hat{q}^2_{n+1}$ or $\hat{p}^2_{n+1}$. Now, in each setting of the two subfamilies of the previous paragraph, $2n$ modes are used to measure a $2n$-quadrature observable relevant for $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n)}$ and the other $m-n$ modes, which are all set either to position or momentum, are ignored. Thus, each relevant element of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n+1)}$ can be estimated by not ignoring one out of the latter $m-n$ modes. That is, the settings to estimate the $2n$-moments $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n)}$ already cover also the estimation of $2(n+1)$-moments $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(n+1)}$. So, the total number of settings used throughout is at most $\binom{m}{n}2^{n+1}$.

As in the end of the previous section, we make a final remark on the error estimation. Also here, the errors of the indirectly estimated moments must be obtained via error propagation, which leads again to an increase in the total number of copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$. Nevertheless, their global scaling with $n$ remains of the same order as that given in equation (11) .

## S5 Stability against systematic errors

Apart from statistical errors, Arthur's measurement procedure could also have systematic errors. That is, if the characterisation of his single-mode measurement channels is erroneous, he could actually be measuring different observables from the ones he thinks he does. Theorems 2 and 3, as well as their Corollaries S1 and S2, consider only statistical errors, i.e., those that can

be decreased by increasing the number of measurement repetitions (and, hence, the number of copies of $\varrho_{\mathrm{p}}$). Since systematic errors cannot be decreased by accumulating statistics, no certification method based exclusively on the measurement statistics can rule them out. However, the stability analyses of Lemmas S6, S9, S12 and S15 hold regardless of the nature of errors. Thus, the experimental estimates $F^{(0)*}$, $F^{(n)*}$, $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(0)*}$, and $F_{\mathcal{S}}^{(n)*}$ (and, therefore, also the certification tests) turn out to be robust also against small systematic errors: The total fidelity deviations due to systematic errors scales linearly with the magnitude of the largest systematic error and polynomially in all the other relevant parameters as given in equations (S48), (S71), (S83), and (S88).

Still, it is illustrative to consider a physically relevant example. A typical systematic error is non-unit quantum efficiency of the detectors used for homodyning. In that case, the probability density function $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ of measurement outcomes $r$ of a quadrature $\hat{r}$ equals the ideal one $\mathcal{P}$ convolutioned with the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}$ of mean zero and squared variance $(1-\eta)/4\eta$, where $\eta$ is the quantum efficiency of the detectors[51]. That is, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(r) = (\mathcal{P} * \mathcal{N})(r) \coloneqq \int dr' \mathcal{P}(r')\mathcal{N}(r-r')$. Using that the first and second *non-central moments* of $\mathcal{N}$ satisfy

$$\langle r \rangle_{\mathcal{N}} \coloneqq \int dr r \mathcal{N}(r-r') = r' \tag{S99a}$$

and

$$\langle r^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{N}} \coloneqq \int dr r^2 \mathcal{N}(r-r') = r'^2 + \frac{1-\eta}{4\eta}, \tag{S99b}$$

respectively, one obtains that

$$\langle r \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} = \langle r \rangle_{\mathcal{P}} \tag{S100a}$$

and

$$\langle r^2 \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} = \langle r^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{P}} + \frac{1-\eta}{4\eta}. \tag{S100b}$$

That is, the expectation value of $\hat{r}$ is not affected by this type of systematic errors and that of $\hat{r}^2$ deviates from the ideal one by $(1-\eta)/(4\eta)$. Furthermore, the expectation values of products of quadrature operators acting on different modes are also not affected, as this type of systematic error acts independently on different modes.

In the absence of statistical errors, this leads to an error vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = \mathbf{0}$ and an error matrix $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}$ that is diagonal and such that $\|\mathcal{E}^{(1)}\|_{\max} \leq (1-\eta)/(4\eta)$, so that $\|\mathcal{E}^{(1)}\|_1 \leq m(1-\eta)/(2\eta)$. Inserting this into equation (S52), we see for instance that, for Gaussian targets, the contribution to the deviation of the fidelity estimate due to non-ideal detector efficiency in the homodyne detectors is smaller than $s_{\max}^2 m \frac{1-\eta}{2\eta}$. This, in turn, is smaller or equal than a desired constant maximal error $\varepsilon$ if

$$\eta \geq \frac{s_{\max}^2 m}{2\varepsilon + s_{\max}^2 m} \approx 1 - \frac{2\varepsilon}{s_{\max}^2 m}, \tag{S101}$$

where the approximation holds whenever $s_{\max}^2 m \gg 2\varepsilon$. The scaling given by the bound (S101) is experimentally convenient in that, in particular, it implies that the detector inefficiency $1-\eta$ needs to decrease only inversely proportional with the number of modes $m$.

Another typical systematic error is the limited power of the local oscillator field used for the homodyne detection: The homodyne (photocurrent difference) statistics, i.e., the distribution of homodyne measurement outcomes, match exactly the statistics of the corresponding quadrature only in the limit of an intense local-oscillator beam[52]. The most obvious difference is that the homodyne statistics is discrete whereas the quadrature statistics is continuous, with the former approximating the latter increasingly better as the local-oscillator power increases. However, we emphasise that our method relies on the estimation of only the expectation values of quadratures and not their full statistics. It can be seen that, provided that the local oscillator is in a coherent state, the effect of limited power is just to increase the variance of the effective quadrature without changing its expectation value with respect to the ideal case. Furthermore, in the multi-mode scenario, if the different modes are homodyned with independent local oscillators, the latter is also true for products of quadratures, as the ones considered in this work. Therefore, the effect of systematic errors due to limited homodyne local-oscillator power in our fidelity estimates is expected not to be critical either.

## S6 Auxiliary mathematical relations

### S6.A Derivation of the properties of the operator valued Pochhammer-Symbol

We begin with equation (22a). The general relationship

$$(a_j^\dagger)^t \hat{n}_j (a_j)^t = p_t(\hat{n}_j), \tag{S102}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, can be shown by induction starting from $p_0(\hat{n}_j) = \hat{n}_j$ and noting that, for all $t \geq -1$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_j^\dagger p_t(\hat{n}) a_j &= a_j^\dagger \hat{n}_j (\hat{n}_j - 1)(\hat{n}_j - 2) \cdots (\hat{n}_j - t) a_j \\ &= a_j^\dagger \hat{n}_j (\hat{n}_j - 1)(\hat{n}_j - 2) \cdots (\hat{n}_j - (t-1)) a_j (\hat{n}_j - (t+1)) \\ &= p_t(\hat{n}_j)(\hat{n}_j - (t+1)) \\ &= p_{t+1}(\hat{n}_j), \end{aligned} \tag{S103}$$

as can be verified using the commutation relations between $a_j$ and $a_j^\dagger$. Setting $t = n_j$ gives equation (22a) .

In turn, equation (22b) can be shown by noting that

$$(a_j^\dagger)^{n_j} (a_j)^{n_j} = (a_j^\dagger)^{n_j - 1} \hat{n}_j (a_j)^{n_j - 1} \tag{S104}$$

and applying equation (S102), for $t = n_j - 1$, to the right-hand side of (S104).

### S6.B Proof of the bound (S43)

Note that for $x = 0$ both sides of equation (S43) yield 1 and hence the bound holds in that case. We make the substitution $y = 1/x$ and show that the bound (S43) holds for all $x > 0$ by proving the following:

$$\frac{1}{1 - \mathrm{e}^{-y}} \leq \frac{1}{y} + \frac{1}{2(1 + 1/y)} + \frac{1}{2} \quad \forall y \geq 0. \tag{S105}$$

But this is equivalent to

$$2y^2 + 3y + 2 \leq \mathrm{e}^y (2 + y). \tag{S106}$$

A straight forward calculation shows that both sides and also the first derivatives of both sides coincide at $y = 0$, while the second derivative of the right hand side is always larger than the second derivative of the left hand side. This proves equation (S105) and hence finishes the proof of the bound (S43).

---


[1] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, *Advances in quantum metrology*, Nat. Phot. **5**, 222 (2011).
[2] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, 409 (2000).
[3] P. Schindler, J. T. Barreiro, T. Monz, V. Nebendahl, D. Nigg, M. Chwalla, M. Hennrich, and R. Blatt, *Experimental repetitive quantum error correction*, Science **332**, 1059 (2011).
[4] R. Barends *et al*, *Logic gates at the surface code threshold: Superconducting qubits poised for fault-tolerant quantum computing*, Nature **508**, 500 (2014).
[5] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, *Goals and opportunities in quantum simulation*, Nat. Phys. **8**, 264 (2012).
[6] A. Aspuru-Guzik and P. Walther, *Photonic quantum simulators*, Nat. Phys. **8**, 285 (2012).
[7] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and S. Nascimbéne, *Quantum simulations with ultra-cold quantum gases*, Nat. Phys. **8**, 267 (2012).
[8] R. Blatt and C. F. Roos, *Quantum simulations with trapped ions*, Nat. Phys. **8**, 277 (2012).
[9] A. A. Houk, H. E. Türeci, and J. Koch, *On-chip quantum simulation with superconducting circuits*, Nat. Phys. **8**, 292 (2012).
[10] X-C. Yao *et al*, *Observation of eight-photon entanglement*, Nat. Phot. **6**, 225 (2012).
[11] Y.-F. Huang *et al*, *Experimental generation of an eight-photon Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger state*, Nat. Comm. **2**, 546 (2012).
[12] M. Chen, N. C. Menicucci, O. Pfister, *Experimental realisation of multipartite entanglement of 60 modes of the quantum optical frequency comb*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 120505 (2014).
[13] S. Yokoyama *et al*, *Optical generation of ultra-large-scale continuous-variable cluster states*, Nat. Phot. **7**, 982 (2013).
[14] J. B. Spring *et al*, *Boson sampling on a photonic chip*, Science **339**, 798 (2013).
[15] M. Tillmann *et al*, *Experimental boson sampling*, Nat. Phot. **7**, 540 (2013).

[16] M. A. Broome *et al*, *Photonic boson sampling in a tunable circuit*, Science **339**, 794 (2013).
[17] A. Crespi *et al*, *Integrated multimode interferometers with arbitrary designs for photonic boson sampling*, Nat. Phot. **7**, 545 (2013).
[18] A. Peruzzo *et al*., *Quantum walks of correlated photons*, Science **329**, 1500 (2010).
[19] A. Crespi *et al*, *Anderson localization of entangled photons in an integrated quantum walk*, Nat. Phot. **7**, 322 (2013).
[20] C. Gogolin, M. Kliesch, L. Aolita, and J. Eisert, *Boson sampling in the light of sample complexity*, arXiv:1306.3995 (2013).
[21] S. Aaronson and A. Arkhipov, *BosonSampling is far from uniform*, arXiv:1309.7460 (2013).
[22] N. Spagnolo *et al*, *Experimental validation of photonic boson sampling*, Nat. Phot. **10**, 1038 (2014).
[23] J. Carolan *et al*, *On the experimental verification of quantum complexity in linear optics* arXiv:1311.2913 (2013).
[24] M. C. Tichy, K. Mayer, A. Buchleitner, and K. Molmer, *Stringent and efficient assessment of Boson-Sampling devices*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 020502 (2014).
[25] D. Gross, Y.-K. Liu, S. T. Flammia, S. Becker, and J. Eisert, *Quantum state tomography via compressed sensing*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 150401 (2010).
[26] D. Aharonov, M. Ben-Or, and E. Eban, *Interactive proofs for quantum computation,* arXiv:0810.5375 (2008).
[27] A. Broadbent, J. Fitzsimons, and E. Kashefi, *Universal blind quantum computation*, Proceedings of the 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2009), 517 (2009); see also J. Fitzsimons and E. Kashefi, *Unconditionally verifiable blind computation*, arXiv:1203.5217 (2012).
[28] T. Kapourniotis, E. Kashefi, and A. Datta, *Verified delegated quantum computing with one pure qubit*, arXiv:1403.1438 (2014).
[29] G. Toth, W. Wieczorek, D. Gross, R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, and H. Weinfurter, *Permutationally invariant quantum tomography*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 250403 (2010).
[30] S. T. Flammia and Y.-K. Liu, *Direct fidelity estimation from few Pauli measurements*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 230501 (2011).
[31] M. P. da Silva, O. Landon-Cardinal, and D. Poulin, *Practical characterisation of quantum devices without tomography*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 210404 (2011).
[32] S. T. Flammia, D. Gross, Y.-K. Liu, and J. Eisert, *Quantum tomography via compressed sensing: Error bounds, sample complexity, and efficient estimators*, New J. Phys. **14**, 095022 (2012).
[33] E. Magesan, J. M. Gambetta, and J. Emerson, *Robust randomized benchmarking of quantum processes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 180504 (2011).
[34] F. Dell'Anno, S. De Siena, L. Albano, and F. Illuminati, *Continuous-variable quantum teleportation with non-Gaussian resources*, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 022301 (2007).
[35] C. Navarrete-Benlloch, R. García-Patrón, J. H. Shapiro, and N. J. Cerf, *Enhancing quantum entanglement by photon addition and subtraction*, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 012328 (2012).
[36] F. Dell'Anno, D. Buono, G. Nocerino, A. Porzio, S. Solimeno, S. De Siena, and F. Illuminati, *Tunable non-Gaussian resources for continuous-variable quantum technologies*, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 043818 (2013).
[37] J. Eisert, D. E. Browne, S. Scheel, and M. B. Plenio, *Distillation of continuous-variable entanglement*, Ann. Phys. (NY) **311**, 431 (2004).
[38] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and G. J. Milburn, *A scheme for efficient quantum computation with linear optics*, Nature **409**, 46 (2001).
[39] P. Kok, W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, T. C. Ralph, J. P. Dowling, and G. J. Milburn *Linear optical quantum computing with photonic qubits*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 135 (2007).
[40] N. C. Menicucci, P. van Loock, M. Gu, C. Weedbrook, T. C. Ralph, and M. A. Nielsen, *Universal quantum computation with continuous-variable cluster states*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 110501 (2006).
[41] M. Gu, C. Weedbrook, N. C. Menicucci, T. C. Ralph, and P. van Loock, *Quantum computing with continuous-variable clusters*, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 062318 (2009).
[42] C. Weedbrook, S. Pirandola, R. Garcia-Patron, N. J. Cerf, T. C. Ralph, J. H. Shapiro, and S. Lloyd, *Gaussian quantum information*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 621 (2012).
[43] J. Eisert and M. B. Plenio, *Introduction to the basics of entanglement theory in continuous-variable systems*, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **1**, 479 (2003).
[44] S. L. Braunstein, *Squeezing as an irreducible resource*, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 055801 (2005).
[45] M. Reck, A. Zeilinger, H. J. Bernstein, and P. Bertani, *Direct characterisation of linear-optical networks*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 58 (1993).
[46] A. Mari and J. Eisert, *Positive Wigner functions render classical simulation of quantum computation efficient*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 230503 (2012).
[47] V. Veitch, C. Ferrie, D. Gross, J. Emerson, *Negative quasi-probability as a resource for quantum computation*, New J. Phys. **14**, 113011 (2012); V. Veitch, N. Wiebe, C. Ferrie, J. Emerson, *Efficient simulation scheme for a class of quantum optics experiments with non-negative Wigner representation*, New J. Phys. **15**, 013037 (2013).
[48] S. Aaronson and A. Arkhipov, *The computational complexity of linear optics*, Theory Comput. **9**, 143 (2013).
[49] L. Aolita, A. Roncaglia, A. Ferraro, and A. Acín, *Gapped two-body Hamiltonian for continuous-variable quantum computation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 090501 (2010).
[50] N. C. Menicucci, S. T. Flammia, and P. van Loock, *Graphical calculus for Gaussian pure states*, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 042335 (2011).
[51] A. Ferraro, S. Olivares, and M. G. A. Paris, *Gaussian states in continuous variable quantum information*, ISBN 88-7088-483-X (Bibliopolis, Napoli, 2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0503237.
[52] S. L. Braunstein, *Homodyne statistics*, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 474 (1990).